The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOLUME XXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, MAY 14, 1924 NUMBER 493

Contents

The Week 293

Editorials
- Progressivism—A Principle or a Method?..... 297
- Money and Government 299
- Europe in Receivership 300

General Articles
- Signs of a New Party.....George Soule 302
- From London to Washington..Frank H. Simonds 304
- The Ohio Gang, II.....Bruce Bliven 305
- Defending the Citadel of Freedom..... .....Willis T. Newton 308
- The Ghost of Art in the Movies.....Ralph Block 310

Correspondence 312

Roosevelt (Verse).....Vachel Lindsay 314

Reviews of Books
- Censoring a Classic.....William McFee 315
- Ramsay MacDonald.....Lewis Mumford 316
- Practical Americanization.....Alvin Johnson 317
- The Children's Claims.....Henry B. Fuller 317
- The Poet Assassinated.....Mary Ellis Opdycke 318
- What Impedes Reform?.....Hulsey Cason 318
- The Tomb of Tut-ankh-amen..T. George Allen 319
- Galápagos: World's End.....G. Kingsley Noble 319

The Week

THE German elections have produced no radical change in the international situation. The moderate parties which favored the acceptance of the Dawes plan have maintained sufficient strength to make acceptance certain, provided there are no intolerable political conditions attached to the plan by French policy. The extreme Nationalists have gained only slightly. The government will have little to fear from their opposition. The Communists, on the other hand, have made surprising gains at the expense of the Socialists, who remain, however, the strongest party in Germany. The point is significant. The Socialists stood with the bourgeois parties in approving the Dawes plan. While the drift to the Communists has been going on for many months, the attitude of the Socialists on the Dawes plan has apparently accelerated the movement. If the Socialists desire to prevent still further defections to communism they will have to move circumspectly in their future dealings with the middle class parties. They are indispensable to any coalition to put through the measures designed to carry the Dawes plan into effect, and are likely to prove less complaisant than they were before the elections.

THE French government denies that it made any commitments on the Dawes plan in consideration of receiving the Morgan credit which saved the franc. This denial must be accepted at its face value. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the essential provisions of the Dawes plan were known both to the French government and to the great bankers. The attitude of the French government toward the plan was decidedly pertinent to any discussion of French credit. Therefore it would be absurd to suppose that the bankers did not inquire, discreetly, what this attitude would be, and equally absurd to suppose that the French government did not reply, discreetly. No such exchange of question and answer would represent a formal "commitment" of the government. For all practical purposes it would, however, be as good as a commitment. There are probably a number of such exchanges in the recesses of the diplomats' and financiers' minds. The French government has no doubt inquired on what terms international credits will be forthcoming to finance German trade, and thus make reparations payments possible. The international bankers have no doubt inquired whether French lust for guarantees is likely to smash the German economic machine after the international investor has acquired a stake in it. Even though such questions have been asked, as we presume they have, the outside public will never receive any official intimation of the fact.

THE Emergency Foreign Policy Conference is an organization of progressives from every part of the United States who believe that a progressive outlook brings with it a positive rather than a negative foreign policy. The majority of Americans who believe in a positive foreign policy with respect to Europe tend to favor a repudiation of the decision of the Senate not to ratify the Treaty of Versailles. But this particular group hopes to use American influence to repair the errors and the injustices which have followed from the Treaty rather than to confirm what remains of the authority of that document. At a meeting which it recently held in Washington it adopted the following resolution which is one of the very few really humane and statesman-like ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pressions of policy with respect to the struggle between France and Germany which any responsible organization has passed in this country: "This Conference expresses regret that the terms under which the Dawes Commission worked prevented their pointing out the necessity for the immediate ending of the dangerous and false situation created by the presence in the Ruhr and Rhineland of French troops and trusts that acceptance of the Dawes recommendations may be conditioned on a clear statement of the intention of the French to evacuate the Ruhr and Rhineland at an early date."

IF the American State Department would act firmly but discreetly on behalf of the policy enunciated in the foregoing resolution it would accomplish far more for the ultimate peace of Europe than it would by proposing the entrance of the United States into the League of Nations. The entrance of the United States into the League, subject to certain conditions, is in our opinion highly desirable, but more important is the policy which the American government, whether within or without the League, will pursue in respect to the Franco-German quarrel. Hitherto American policy has never assumed as its major premise the existence of an intolerable wrong which the victors did to Germany by the sanctions set up in the Treaty of Versailles and by the occupation of the Ruhr. Moreover that element in American public opinion which has agitated most vigorously for American intervention in Europe has not, with one or two exceptions, raised its voice against the gross abuse of power which France perpetrated by seizing the Ruhr coal fields and factories. The consequence is that very little pressure is being brought to bear on France to get out; and the absence of this pressure is likely to result in the failure of the Dawes plan. The French government in the absence of such pressure will scarcely relax its grip on the throat of Germany. Perhaps in the event of the failure of the Dawes plan those Americans of all parties who are so anxious to use American resources to help Europe may come to see that the most promising way to do so is to agitate in favor of resolutions such as the one about the Ruhr passed by the Emergency Foreign Policy Conference.

AT the same meeting of the Conference Senator Shipstead renewed an old but most desirable suggestion which looks in the direction of subjecting American foreign policy to democratic control. He proposes that the Secretary of State sit in the Senate, prepared, whenever asked, to answer questions pertaining to foreign relations which members of the Senate may put to him. This expedient would in the Senator's opinion "remove the questions pertaining to foreign relations of the American government from the cloisters of secret diplomacy into the arena of American public opinion." Probably Mr. Shipstead exaggerates the effect of the proposed exposure of the Secretary of State to senatorial inquisition. European ministers of foreign affairs sit in parliaments and answer questions. Yet there has been more secret diplomacy in Europe than in the United States. It is in the nature of some diplomacy to be public and unequivocal. It is in the nature of some other diplomacy to be furtive, evasive and ambiguous. If a nation's foreign policy is egoistic, jealous and dangerous to the interests of other countries, it is necessarily conducted in secret; and any Secretary of State will refuse for reasons of state to answer inconvenient and searching questions. Nevertheless we entirely agree with Senator Shipstead in wishing that the Senate would request the Secretary of State to appear before it on stated occasions ready to answer questions of which he has received notice. The device would stimulate popular and congressional understanding and discussion of foreign policy. It would increase the responsibility of the State Department to public opinion and to the Senate, and it would give to the State Department a pulpit from which it could officially address, whenever it had something to say, a national audience.

SOME of our newspaper writers are unduly excited over the alleged negotiations for a military alliance between France and Japan. Both nations are too canny to commit themselves to the responsibilities involved in a formal military alliance. That the two nations have discussed their common interests, with a view to joint action in certain contingencies is, however, not only possible but probable. The United States is the only great power that can afford to remain an independent in international politics. All the other powers naturally range themselves in parties. At present the party leaders are England and France. And since England is committed to a policy of unbreakable friendship with the United States, Japan's opponent in the game of the Pacific, Japan would naturally range herself with the French party, just as she was inclined, in spite of the Anglo-Japanese alliance, to range herself before the war with the German party. Such international party alliances count for something in diplomatic discussions. They are too tenuous, however, to endanger the peace.

A NUMBER of critics are busy nowadays pointing out that women fail to live up to the opportunities afforded them by their new status as voters. While the contention is not wholly without merit, we suggest to those who make it that they could peruse with profit the record of the fourth annual convention of the National League of Women Voters, concluded a few days ago at Buffalo, New York. This organization is far from perfect, as its leaders would be the first to concede; yet on

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the basis of the evidence we submit that it is infinitely better, in purposes, activities and results, than any masculine organization of similar character. Political activity on behalf of any existing party is forbidden by the by-laws of the N. L. W. V.; and this rule is rigidly enforced (although the members are, of course, not only permitted but encouraged to affiliate as individuals with the political party of their choice). The result is that the League in operation gives a sort of preliminary sketch of what the politics of Utopia will be like. Unpartisan both as to parties and individuals, it centres its efforts on those measures which it believes are in the best interest of the citizens of the United States.

THE politicians are waking up to the fact that such women's organizations as this represent a considerable power in public affairs. Mrs. Maud Wood Park, retiring president, pointed out in her annual report at the recent convention that of the thirteen planks in the League program in 1920, two-thirds have already been enacted into federal statutes. In the individual states the League has secured the passage of 420 bills and has defeated sixty-four. It is organized in 346 of 433 congressional districts; twenty-three of its state-wide and fifteen of its city-wide organizations maintain regular headquarters. Thirty-two publications appear under the League imprint, practically all of which make a feature of carrying authoritative matter on all sides of every important public question. Numerous other occasional publications are produced, in connection with the League's frequent citizenship schools and state conferences on pressing public questions.

AN aspect of the League's work which might well be commended to imitators is its reluctance to pass large quantities of well-meaning resolutions on subjects as to which nothing more is ever done. The N. L. W. V. endorses no project without promptly arranging a year's work on its behalf. For the coming year a "get-out-the-vote" campaign will be a major activity. The League will also fight vigorously on behalf of the child labor amendment to the Constitution. International coöperation to prevent war is another project in which the League is keenly interested. During the coming year, as during the one just closed, the League will work actively on behalf of American participation in the World Court.

TO those in close contact with the work of the League there was grotesque absurdity in the poster recently issued by the Chemical Warfare Service of the United States army attacking this and a number of other organizations of women as being influenced and aided by Moscow in furtherance of the "pacifist effort" to "cripple the United States Army and Navy." Laying aside the question of the gross impropriety of propaganda by a branch of the United States army, and laying aside as well the strong probability that every other accusation made on this poster is false, the National League of Women Voters, as the army authorities could have discovered by the briefest research, is about the last in this country in which Moscow would be likely to interest itself. For the League is a middle-of-the-road organization; it is careful, for instance, never to advise its members to vote for women for public office because they are women, but only if they are the persons best fitted to carry on the work in question. We repeat: on the evidence of what the National League of Women Voters has done in the past four years it would be just as appropriate, or more so, to discuss the failure of the masculine citizens as that of the women.

PRESIDENT NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER was not precisely tactful in phrasing his anti-prohibition speech, but there is much more health in his frank opposition to the law and his frank affirmation of the impossibility of enforcing it than there is in the optimism of the prohibitionists. Of course it is not true that the law cannot be enforced. It could be enforced by the organization of a federal liquor police, consisting of members whose names were suggested by the local churches or anti-saloon leagues and costing probably several hundred million dollars a year. This police force would need a huge appropriation for espionage, so that no violator of the law would dare to drink except alone or in the most select company. It would need the power to search premises on the barest suspicion and the actual possession of any alcoholic beverage without a federal license would have to be made a crime. By means such as these the prohibition law could probably be enforced almost as well as the laws against robbery, but they could not be adopted without causing something like a revolution in American political and social life. Short of some really drastic measure of enforcement the law will continue to be largely disregarded and will continue to have its present demoralizing effect on American political and social standards. The convinced prohibitionists will in the course of time have to adopt one of two alternatives. They will either have to go forward to a policy of more drastic enforcement or they will have to relax in some way the provisions of the Volstead Act.

THE Senate vote of 48 to 27 for full publicity of tax returns is decidedly disturbing to men of old fashioned notions of privacy. The provision is likely to be lost somewhere on the road the taxation measure has still to traverse before enactment. Nevertheless, the fact that it could pass either House is significant. The unprivileged masses have never accepted the doctrine that the amount of a man's income is his private affair. They have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

believed that the chief purpose of such privacy is to make tax dodging easy. Recent discussions of the workings of tax exemption have strengthened this belief. There has been a notable shrinkage in the largest incomes since the enactment of the super-tax laws, apparently a much larger shrinkage than can be accounted for by the transfer of investments to tax exempt securities. What has happened here? So long as tax returns are treated as a strictly private matter the public can only guess.

AN important objection to the publicity provision in the tax bill is that it gives the President an additional reason for exercising his veto. Even without this provision the bill as it comes from conference will be distasteful to the President. The surtax will probably be nearer the House rates than those proposed by Mellon. There is small reason for anticipating the dropping of the proposed increase in the estate tax. Even senators who are personally inclined toward the Mellon plan would prefer to play safe with popular sentiment, at the present time. After the election it is conceivable that a more conservative measure might pass. It is conceivable, though not in our opinion probable. President Coolidge, however, has more faith in the inherent conservatism of American politics than we have. Therefore, if he can find a good excuse, he is likely to veto the present bill and gamble on a more favorable sentiment in the next Congress.

ATTENTION in America has been so concentrated on the Dawes report that the document which accompanied it has been generally overlooked. An interesting point in regard to it is made by John Maynard Keynes in a recent issue of the Nation (London) as follows:

> If the Dawes Report opens a new chapter, the McKenna Report closes one of the strangest in modern history,—a most perfect example of tragic irony and the turning of the tables on those guilty of the excessive. For five years Germany's victors have squeezed the lemon with both hands, have heard the "pips squeak" and felt their own hands ache, have seen a trickle flowing into the bowl,—only to discover in the end that every drop has come, not from the lemon, but from the hands themselves. What Germany has appeared to pay in Reparations is nearly equal to what the foreign world has subscribed in return for worthless marks. The same illusion, the same ill-calculating ignorance, which generated oppressive and impossible demands, have brought forth also these vast losses, before which the losses of all previous Bubbles are nothing. A million foreigners, we are told, have acquired bank balances in Germany, and each of these accounts has cost its owner on the average about 400 pounds. It is these lively gentlemen who have paid the bill so far. These are the rich ones,—the bankers, the financial experts. Beyond them are the many millions, the housemaids and the hairdressers, who have bought a few shillings' worth or a few pounds' worth of crisp Reichsbank emissions, fresh with the ink of the press,—until all the world knows the smell of a new German note.
>
> It is not reasonable to believe that this prodigious process has been brought about by the conscious guile and subtlety of the German people. The same sink, which has swallowed up the voluntary, gambling surplus of the foreign world, has swallowed up also the indispensable, relied-on savings of the mass of the German people. Germany has been the scene of the most extensive redistribution of national wealth from the many to the few ever experienced within a like space of time, until she has become the outstanding example of distributive injustice. The death of the great Stinnes, who saw first and most passionately the glorious chances which civil disturbance, whether it be political or economic, must always offer to the bold and debonair freebooter, brings down the curtain with a just appropriateness. The extravaganza is over, and Common Sense resumes her quiet sway.

"THE importance of interesting young men and women in the civic duties and obligations, which must always constitute an important part of their debt to the community, is hardly to be overestimated . . . I shall be glad to extend every encouragement to efforts of this kind, confident that they represent an important phase of the paramount task of preparing a people to meet the problems of self-government." Such is Mr. Coolidge's expression of gratitude to the Director of the College Bureau of the Republican National Committee. The efforts to which he refers consist in organizing the colleges for Coolidge. In short, the youth of the country is publicly advised by President Coolidge that it is the fulfillment of a public duty to prepare to vote for Candidate Coolidge. The episode, unimportant in itself, nevertheless precisely illustrates one very great and very dangerous advantage which a President possesses over all other aspirants to the office: his words have a publicity value and a prestige value out of all comparison with those of other candidates.

AS President he can command a hearing, and as President he can speak lofty words of general advice; and as candidate he can utilize these advantages for the advancement of his candidacy. The limits within which such advantage can be pressed are no doubt drawn pretty sharply by public opinion. In principle, however, any appeal of this sort, direct or specious, is not essentially different from the control of party machinery through the distribution of public offices as patronage; and that is not essentially different from the intimidation of the electorate through the control of the military. It is fundamentally silly for the American conscience to boggle over such practices and yet countenance the principle of presidential advantage in milder forms. A really sensitive pub-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lic conscience would put a President at positive disadvantage in the campaign for reëlection.

IN November, 1920, a spy of the Department of Justice, dressed as a laboring man, scraped an acquaintance with one Joseph Baltrusaitis, of St. Louis, a Lithuanian, and secured from him copies of communist pamphlets. These pamphlets were written in English, which Baltrusaitis cannot read or write; and he claims he was ignorant of their contents, they having been left with him for safe keeping by a Russian. Nevertheless, he was arrested for "discouraging the recruiting and enlistment of soldiers," and after appealing his case in vain, he was sent a few days ago to Leavenworth Prison to serve two years, although the espionage act was long ago suspended and although, of course, the recruiting of soldiers had stopped two years before Baltrusaitis's alleged offence. Comment on this case is hardly necessary. It is a flagrant example of lynch law operating to suppress a member of an unpopular minority. We earnestly hope President Coolidge will live up to the opportunity presented to him and set Baltrusaitis free at once.

THE Detroit Academy of Surgery has no use for Henry Ford's hospital. Its methods are said to be too much like those of a garage and repair shop. We should expect something of the kind in a Ford institution. But two of the objections of the Academy read humorously when taken together. The Ford hospital charges uniform fees, weighing heavily on the poor and rendering difficult "the collection by private physicians or surgeons of adequate fees from the rich;" and its methods entail the loss of "the fine intimate personal touch between patient and physician."

Progressivism—A Principle or a Method?

IN the correspondence columns of this issue we publish two letters on domestic politics which are worth the attention of our readers. Their authors suggest and answer several questions of prime importance about the nature and source of a possible third party, the motives of its members for being progressive and what means it should adopt in order to succeed as a promoter of progressive politics. Important as these questions are, there are radical differences of opinion among progressives as to what the answers to them should be. Yet if the insurgents are ever to create a party which will seriously and permanently challenge the domination of the older parties in American politics, they will have to reach a much better understanding than they now have about the nature of the enterprise on which they are embarked and the conditions of probable success.

In the opinion of Mr. C. A. Norman, for instance, the progressives are politically ineffective at present chiefly for one reason. They lack the moral and intellectual binder which can only come from an ardent belief in some fundamental principle or purpose which will establish and sharpen the fighting issue between them and their opponents. The lack to which Mr. Norman calls attention is real and important. American progressivism is nourished almost exclusively by the grievances and the demands of special regions and groups. There is no one idea, program or leader capable of giving momentum, power and cohesion to the scattered cohorts of the progressives. Nevertheless we do not believe, as Mr. Norman implies, that they can focus their efforts on some triumphant principle or program by an act of will, an eruption of common feeling or a flight of leadership. An effective progressive political agitation will derive its vitality from the increase of progressive economic and social activities, but such activities will not to the same extent be born of successful agitation.

If American progressivism lacks the integrity of constructive ideas, if its friends are composed of groups united chiefly by special grievances, there is one sufficient explanation of this handicap and one sufficient remedy for it. The American people are not as yet sufficiently aware of common economic grievances, nor are they sufficiently agreed in imputing to the existing distribution of political power the grievances of which they are aware, to organize and wield an effective partisan instrument of economic and social reconstruction. The prevailing social and economic practices, notwithstanding a good deal of friction and an enormous admitted waste of raw materials and human effort, continue to satisfy more of their needs and to articulate with more of their ideas than does any alternative which they are able to envisage. No miracle of leadership, enthusiasm or organization of conviction can dispose of this stubborn obstacle to the early formation of a progressive national third party. Such a party will never obtain the focus which it needs for success unless it becomes the expression in politics of a discontented economic class or group of classes as important, as conscious and as politically competent as the merchant class was in carrying on first the federal and then the Whig party or the agrarian pioneers were in organizing the Democracy. The third party will eventually come, but it will come not only as the result of an increasing fund of progressive convictions and continued agitation, but as the result of patient waiting for the growth of a class or combination of classes which is entitled by its members, to a larger share in the government of the country than the existing parties are willing to grant.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

National parties are not bound together primarily by devotion to principles or a leader. They consist of groups of citizens who enter into a voluntary association for the purpose of sharing and exercising the power vested in the government. In a democracy like the United States whose people have been, if not generally prosperous, at least generally expectant of prosperity, both national political parties have been inevitably operated and controlled by people who are satisfied with things as they are and will not seriously consider any but trivial modifications of the prevailing economic and political institutions and practices. They compete for control of the government, but they coöperate in order to prevent the control from passing to other people who are not being benefited by the existing brand of prosperity. This second function is less obvious but more fundamental than the first. The Democratic and the Republican parties are directed fundamentally by men who have profited, are profiting or expect to profit by the existing distribution of economic and political power. They represent the most successful, the most self-confident, the least inhibited, the most headstrong and the most self-righteous middle class which the economic expansion of the last four generations has produced in any modern country.

Progressive agitations which have accomplished desirable reforms have taken place within both parties. At one time it looked as if the transition from an economy which glorified and protected individual acquisition at any social cost to an economy which would require individual acquisition to justify itself by its stimulating effect on the general economic and social energy of the community might take place as the result of an idealistic agitation within the parties. As a matter of fact insurgency with a progressive outlook won the allegiance in 1912 of a majority of the Republican voters and earned the right to nominate Mr. Roosevelt as the party's candidate for President; but the danger of a defeat for conservatism immediately revealed what official Republicanism really stood for. The Old Guard preferred to count Roosevelt out rather than allow their progressive associates to control the party. Since then there has been no possibility of using the Republican party as the agency of progressive economic reforms. Many progressives remained Republicans and owing to their strength with the people in their own states could not be cast out of the party, but they have remained outcasts within the fold. Republicanism has since 1912 developed steadily in the direction of conscious dogmatic conservatism. It represents those successful classes which in the end will always do, as the Old Guard did in 1912, anything which has to be done to preserve their power.

The Democrats are in this respect less committed than the Republicans. They represent a more humble and less prosperous section of the middle class. Owing to their mitigated antagonism to Republicanism they seem likely to remain as loyal to the memory of Wilson progressivism as the official Republicans are disloyal to Roosevelt progressivism. When voting at particular elections it may be desirable for progressives to favor the choice of Democratic candidates in order to defeat their more undesirable Republican competitors. But the Democratic party cannot become the instrument of radical progressivism without a revolution in its control. The most powerful element in the party is the Southern cotton growers who are fundamentally as complacent and as conservative as the official Republicans. If a threatening radical insurgent movement appeared, they would unite with the Republicans in order to stifle it. In so far as any thorough-going changes in American national economy are to be accomplished by political agitation, that agitation will sooner or later have to abjure allegiance to both existing parties, break up their membership and redistribute their power.

A successful third party will not, consequently, as Mr. Norman indicates, be focussed by an idea or a principle, no matter how persuasive and inspiring a proposed principle may appear to be. Its recruits will come from classes and sections in the community which have discovered that the existing exercise of economic and political power does not sufficiently consider their interests and its distribution does not allow them to participate effectively in the determination of official policy. Recruits of this kind come in slowly and are not easy to obtain or to hold. For the American economic system still manages to distribute a considerable measure of economic comfort and to secure the services of the more energetic and ambitious members of the community, and through its prestige and its control of the avenues of publicity it retains the allegiance of many millions of people who can no longer expect to benefit from its characteristic opportunities and privileges. But there is a steadily increasing number of voters, consisting chiefly of farmers and wage-earners, who are coming to understand that the national economy is operated by a class of business men and their parasites whose interests are considered equivalent to the public interest in spite of the fact that they frequently conflict with the no less humanly justifiable interests of other classes. These privileged classes do not propose to alter the national policy or surrender the power to determine what the national policy is without a fierce and prolonged struggle.

The protestants are not conscious, numerous and resolute enough as yet to form a party which is capable of threatening the power of the older parties, but if the existing economic favoritism continues their numbers will steadily increase. In the meantime those who believe in the need of a third

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

party should accept the insurgency of today for all that it is worth but for no more than it is worth. They will lose more than they gain by pretending that political agitation can either provoke or mobilize the kind of thorough-going conscious economic and social discontent which is necessary to give cohesion and permanent power to a national progressive party. On the other hand it would be fatal for them to renounce political agitation merely because it is not as all-sufficient as politicians assume it to be. A progressive party must be willing to continue political agitation even though it is well aware of the limitations of the weapon and the remoteness of success. It should recognize both that it cannot get along without political propaganda and that words divorced from activities are the characteristic weakness of progressive agitators. A wide-awake progressive is bound to suspect all propaganda including that which he himself prefers and to seek the realization of his cause not through the propagation of supposed-to-be salutary ideas but through the increasing ability of people of all classes to carry on, to adjust, to understand and to liberalize their own and other activities.

Our other correspondent Mr. Henry J. Sowerby also misinterprets in our opinion the function of pinciples and of consciousness in the economy of progressive politics. He protests against a recent article in the New Republic on the grounds that it purveyed "doubts" about the ability of progressives to accomplish their own objects instead of instilling courage into them by counsels of faith and positive guidance. But much as progressives and all other people (including those whose precarious business it is to mold public opinion) may need faith and positive guidance, they need even more a habit of questioning the principles which they are asked to accept as salutary. The habit of refusing to take principles for granted is indispensable provided their adherents are to generate from the principles trustworthy methods of giving reality to them. Unless progressives educate themselves into such a habit of mind their progressivism will crystallize into specific dogmas which they will seek to impose on the lives of other people. Progressivism is essentially a method rather than a principle—a method which has to be realized in individual and social activities. Individuals who practice the method are obliged to be sceptical, for without scepticism they cannot plant the experiments and gather the kind of knowledge which is necessary to the realization of their particular purpose. Conservatives can afford to nourish themselves on principles which are supposed to get themselves realized automatically. They are content with things as they happen. But progressives stake their credit on their ability to make different and better methods work in human life. Their motto should be not "Do it now," but "Watch your step."

Money and Government

It is the influence of money which has brought idealism into contempt and exalted materialism and gain as the right standards of private and national life.—*William G. McAdoo, address at Long Beach, April 30, 1924.*

THESE words would be impressive if they had been recited as a Peccavi. For the most striking political fact of the day is the virtual elimination from the presidential contest of the man who stood out as far the most eligible Democratic candidate, William G. McAdoo. He was eliminated not for any positive wrongdoing but for a materialism that grasped at large legal fees from clients whose character and business methods were likely to place them in opposition to sound public policy if not to the law of the land. It was a materialism that had already found expression in his letter of resignation from the Treasury and the Director-Generalship of the Railways, November 22, 1918.

"For almost six years," he wrote, "I have worked under the pressure of great responsibilities. Their exactions have drawn heavily on my strength. The inadequate compensation allowed by law to Cabinet officers . . . and the very burdensome cost of living in Washington have so depleted my personal resources that I am obliged to reckon with the facts of the situation. . . . I must, for the sake of my family, get back to private life and retrieve my personal fortunes."

We do not recall that there was any general criticism, in the press or elsewhere, of the position then taken by Mr. McAdoo. The post he was abandoning was one of immense responsibility and prestige. The work for which he exchanged this post was of no public consequence. In the practice of law a man of national reputation and great native ability might perform an immensely valuable public service if he selected his cases solely with a view to advancing the adaptation of the law to evolving human needs. But no one who goes into law for the sake of repairing his private fortunes can count on achieving much beyond that end. Mr. McAdoo was deliberately setting his private fortunes above his opportunities for significant public service.

Few hard headed, practical men will even today admit that there is anything wrong in this. A similar choice has been made by a host of other Americans whose abilities would have been of great value to the public. They "cannot afford" to hold public office. The position is defensible in private ethics. Is it in public ethics? The state of affairs partly revealed in the investigations carried on in Washington answers this question quite definitely.

It has been known for twenty-five hundred years that no people can have a great art unless men of ability and intelligence regard art as an end in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself, with rewards of its own that cannot be measured by money. It has been known even longer that no people can have good government unless the better part of mankind regards public service as an end in itself, with its own peculiar rewards and privileges. The arts and government alike decay when money is thrust into the foreground. And every man who exchanges a position of public responsibility for a position of greater private gain helps the age to thrust money into the foreground.

But it will be said, the artist and the public servant must live. Indeed they must; but by what material standard? Must they live on the fat of the land, like successful adulterators and monopolists, who have no other reward for their toiling and scheming but the good things money will buy? Or might they be content with a material standard that suffices to maintain them in their work? A Cabinet officer receives $12,000 a year. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court receives $15,000, and the Associate Justices $14,500. Senators and congressmen have to get on with $7,500. The able men who do the expert work of the administrative departments receive salaries which range from $3,500 to not very much above $6,000.

These are modest emoluments. They compare very unfavorably with the rewards which men of ability may attain to in private business. They are too low. The government ought to be a generous employer. But there is no reason why it should be expected to match the rewards of private industry, if public service is an end in itself. Our public servants at Washington are numerous enough to fix a standard of their own, under which they might live within the salaries a democratic state can pay.

They have not done so. Go where you please in Washington, among our national legislators, among the department and bureau chiefs, and you hear the same bitter complaint of the difficulty of living on government salaries. You hear the same jealous comparisons with the prosperity of brokers, grocers, haberdashers. You encounter a sense of grievance against the government and against life itself. It is inevitable that many public servants should have their eyes fixed on the possibilities of private gain that accidentally present themselves. In the circumstances good government is impossible.

We shall not extirpate the forces of evil in government by making public office a rich man's job. Neither shall we succeed in doing so by any conceivable improvement in salaries. The only hope for a better state of feeling among our public officials and therefore for efficient and honest work lies in a recognition of the public service as an end for which it is worth while to sacrifice rich food and fine raiment, swift cars and luxuriously appointed houses. Our best public officials recognize this principle today. We shall have to recognize it as a people, so that no man who cannot live happily though austerely will cease to cumber the public business with his injurious presence.

Europe in Receivership

THE affairs of Europe have undergone a profound change in the last six months. It is a change which has come on so gradually that only when we make a deliberate attempt at comparison does its significance become plain. Six months ago the immediate objective of French policy was the setting up of an "independent" Rhine republic, with the ultimate object of forcing upon Germany a desperate resistance which could only lead to her final ruin. The position of England with respect to the possible French-German conflict was ambiguous. Indeed, to the French it seemed fairly certain that England would lean toward the German side. It was not only the extremists but many persons of moderate habits of thought who saw safety for France only in an air force that was sufficient to bully England into quiescence.

Military forecasters were working out all possible combinations of the nations. Would Italy come in against France, or remain neutral? Would Poland and the Little Entente prove capable of doing the work France had laid out for them, or would they shrink back under the menace of an Austro-Hungarian-Bulgarian combination, with Russia in reserve?

All such calculations wear now an aspect of unreality. War may indeed come to Europe, but it is no longer safe to talk of the inevitable war, required to liquidate the insoluble problems left over from the Great War and the Treaty of Versailles. A new force which has been operating under the surface for many months has now come out into the daylight—international finance. It is to the banker, not to the statesman, that the world now turns. The statesmen must of course keep on blustering, for consistency's sake. But everyone can see that the statesmen have been thrust well into the background. The bankers are taking over the European concern.

Their first obvious victory was won in the acceptance by France of an economic commission to inquire into the reparations question. France had held stubbornly to the principle that all inquiries should be conducted by the Reparations Commission, which she controlled. What made her yield, even so far as to admit of a supplementary inquiry? It was a belated recognition of the dependence of stable government upon finance. Austria had been rescued from anarchy by international finance. Hungary, after years of experimenting with government based on military force, was ready to surrender itself into the hands of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the bankers. The Italian Fascisti, who set out to order affairs by the rods and axes of old Rome, had found that the good will of the international bankers was required to consolidate their victory. Even Soviet Russia was crying incessantly for international credits and preparing—though with the worst of grace—to make substantial concessions in return. France has had too much experience with international finance as an instrument of control to underestimate its power. Therefore, when the decline of the franc had begun to reveal too palpably the weakness of a policy of violence, she yielded. Of course, she sought to save her face. The report of the Dawes commission had to be unanimous, thus giving veto power to the French members, who were directly controlled by the French government. The report of the commission had to be accepted by the Reparations Commission, where France was again in a position to veto its findings. Finally, the government did not pledge itself formally to accept the report. France can still force concessions as a condition to acceptance.

No one can say that France has formally surrendered her freedom of action. Yet the outcome will amount to that if she accepts the Dawes plan as it stands, in good faith. The plan is the financier's scheme, not the French statesmen's. France can reject it, but on pain of bankruptcy. Germany also can reject it, on pain of chaos. It is not yet certain that either France or Germany is prepared to follow the course common sense would prescribe. We may see another deadlock, attended by a financial crisis in France and grave social disorders in Germany. But the bankers are likely to have their way in the end.

The bankers hold the power of keeping Europe at peace or plunging her into war. They hold an indefinite power over internal legislation and administration. It was with their approval, if not at their instance, that Italy abandoned government ownership of railways. They approved, if they did not compel, the discontinuance of reconstruction work on borrowed money in France. Working through the machinery of the Dawes plan they will be able to exert a dominant influence upon German legislation. In Austria their control of all legislation that may have a financial bearing is unquestioned, and soon a similar control will be exercised in Hungary. Poland and the Little Entente and even Russia are likely to accept a considerable control of their internal affairs within the next decade.

It is a tremendous power the bankers hold in their hands. How will they use it? We are safe in saying that they will use it more wisely than the Allied statesmen have used the power that fell to them upon the collapse of Germany. A banking hegemony of Europe, as compared with a German, French or British political hegemony, is likely to prove enlightened and humane. The bankers are schooled by their business interests to stamp on hatred and tendencies toward revenge. They are schooled to look upon the economic relations between states as mutually profitable, not as a game of violence and overreaching. Under the bankers' receivership we may therefore expect to see military preparations absorbing less and less of the energies of Europe. We may expect to see the obstructions to trade between nations set up after the war gradually removed. For the immediate present we must no doubt regard financial intervention as a force making for a reconstruction of European life, and a force operating more effectively than any other that is available.

But the empire of finance will not limit itself to allaying international disorders, prying open the gates to trade. It will inevitably exert an influence upon the relations of the economic classes within the several states subject to its control. And it is fairly plain on what side of the economic conflict it will range itself.

International finance will favor economy in governmental expenditures. This will mean a damper on social legislation: old age pensions, health and employment insurance and the like. It will favor a scheme of taxation which encourages business: excises and customs on articles of wide popular consumption rather than profits and income taxes. It will look with disfavor upon any increase in the power of labor that might result in putting wages above the minimum for efficient work or in reducing the hours of labor with material loss in production. Nobody will be able to say precisely where the hand of international finance is intervening. It will work through the class that serves its purpose, the merchants, bankers and industrialists.

The continent of Europe, after its waste on war and its post war extravagance, is going into receivership. The bankers, like any other receivers, will be animated chiefly by considerations of productive yield. Human claims will have to be kept in abeyance, so long as the receivership operates. The bankers may reconstruct Europe, but the Europe of their reconstruction will be a bourgeois, not a social-democratic world.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1924, IN THE U. S., BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING CO., INC., 421 WEST 21ST ST., NEW YORK.
HERBERT CROLY, PRES. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREAS.
DANIEL MEBANE, CIRCULATION MANAGER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON R. M. LOVETT STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAWNEY
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Signs of a New Party

I

THE prospect of a political organization in the United States corresponding roughly to the British Labor party has been dimmed in the past not so much by any lack of economic need or desire for it on the part of determined minorities as by the lack of a situation favorable to overcoming certain practical difficulties peculiar to this country. It now seems likely that the requisite situation may be furnished in the summer of 1924.

One basic difficulty has been the occupational distribution of our population. Even if all industrial wage-earners were affiliated with the trades-union movement, and that movement succeeded in mobilizing their votes in an independent party, the party would still form a minority of the electorate. With approximately half of our population in agricultural regions, and that half chiefly made up, not of hired workers but of independent proprietors or those who aspire to become so, no purely socialist or wage-earning party could succeed. There must be a long-continued disaffection with existing political arrangements among a large proportion of the farmers, and that disaffection must take a direction parallel to the natural aims of labor. In addition, it was desirable to attract as many as possible of the small business men and professional classes. The difficulty was not merely a matter of large drifts of interest, it was also one of personnel. It would be unlikely indeed that the requisite leaders, capable of appealing at once to such widely separated sections and traditions, would arise at first either from professional trade-unionists or the rank-and-file farmers. Some more distinctly national and non-classifiable leadership was necessary. Such professional people as were interested did not have the requisite reputation or political experience.

A second difficulty, interweaving with the first, has been the political constitution and habit of the nation. In a parliamentary government, the legislature tends to be more important, and a party can thrive for a long time as a minority on account of the effectiveness and prominence of its parliamentary representatives. In the United States the legislature is not only checked, but also at many times overwhelmed by the judiciary and especially by the executive. No effective party long remains as a third party; it either comes within striking distance of the presidency or disappears from the sphere of influence by merger or erosion.

Another set of circumstances not so fundamental has been the special situation of the labor movement. The present national trade-unions for the most part built up their strength after disastrous experiments by labor with far-flung political theories. Samuel Gompers and most of their other leaders, with strong practical sense, believed in concentrating their energies on gradual progress in the economic field of action. The movement resisted Socialist agitation strongly, and historical feuds developed between the various Socialist parties and the officials of the trade unions. It required the separation of the more revolutionary and impractical political group from the Socialists to narrow the breach between the bulk of the unions and the politically minded workers. A clear distinction was necessary between those who wanted complete revolution and those who were willing to follow in politics a step-by-step policy such as is normally characteristic of trade-union action.

Such obstacles were perhaps not clearly visualized by the political and labor leaders concerned, but they undoubtedly determined the survival of those groups temperamentally committed to an opportunist course. In spite of many local labor and Socialist parties, and several attempts, especially in the last few years, to broaden them into national movements, no national farmer-labor party could thrive without the support of the stronger national trade-unions and farmer organizations, and without a national leadership trained in practical politics. Not until these factors fuse is an effective labor party possible in the United States.

II

The visible beginning of the present development was the formation of the Conference for Progressive Political Action early in 1922. This represented the newer farmers' and coöperative organizations of the West, and a large number of the more powerful and progressive unions such as the railroad brotherhoods and other crafts, the clothing workers and the miners. The Socialist party, after the separation of the Communists, was also ready to join this group. Many members of the Conference were from the beginning hopeful of the ultimate foundation of a new party. The Conference was not formed with this purpose, however, but on account of the immediate necessity of doing something to resist the ravages of reactionary political forces and economic disorder. In spite of much pressure and criticism from the organizations committed to the immediate formation of a party, the Conference declined to take the decisive step. It saw clearly the difficulties, and the need of making a more modest beginning. It undertook non-partisan action, whose political effectiveness had been demonstrated by the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota.

The critics of the Conference saw no difference between its methods and the old Federation of Labor plan of rewarding friends and punishing enemies. There were, however, important differ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ences. One was the formulation and dissemination of concrete aims and principles. Another was a far more energetic action in creating local organizations and vitalizing them. Still more important was the use of the primary to nominate in the old parties, so that the ultimate choice would not be merely a choice of evils. And in localities where new farmers' or labor parties were strong enough to promise success, the Conference had no scruples about deserting the old party organizations. Distinctly, it understood its political grievances and aims. It was able to hammer out a practical and significant unity among its varied elements. And it was able to get results at the polls. The progressive senators and congressmen elected in 1922 who now hold the balance of power owe much to its efforts. They owe so much more to it than to their party organizations that they have had the courage to act as a virtual third party in Congress. For the first time in years Senator La Follette does not stand alone in his adherence to the causes of labor and the more dissatisfied farmers.

At the beginning of the present session of Congress it was still uncertain when, if ever, the Conference would be willing to step out as an independent national party and consolidate its organization. Circumstances have since changed its outlook. No action by Congress has materially assisted the sorry plight of the wheat farmers. The success of the British Labor party has heartened the advocates of independent political action both in the rank and file and among the leadership. The exposure of corruption by the various investigations has not only created a favorable political situation, but has made it almost impossible for the nominally Republican members of the progressive group in Congress to continue long any kind of allegiance to their national party machine. The effect of these exposures on William G. McAdoo's chances of securing the Democratic nomination seemed to eliminate from consideration the one promising candidate on the Democratic side, who had been looked upon with some favor by the railroad unions. Furthermore, McAdoo's lack of decision and coherence on the railroad issues has punctured any existing enthusiasm for him. The deep devotion felt for the steadfastness and incorrigible honesty of La Follette on the part not only of the western progressives but also of even the more conservative trade-unions suddenly crystallized into a conviction that he was the one experienced national leader who could unite all the essential constituencies. Surveys of the political situation gave rise to strong hopes that La Follette, running as an independent candidate for President, could muster enough electoral votes to prevent the candidate of either established party from securing a majority, and so could throw the choice of President into the hands of the progressive balance of power in Congress. Such power could, of course, command compromise and concessions. And, to make assurance doubly sure, the dominating Republican machine proceeded to take the offensive by reading out of the party the very group of senators and congressmen affiliated with the Conference. As a result of these developments, the Conference has been laying its plans with the definite expectation that neither the Republican nor the Democratic candidate and platform would be acceptable, and that La Follette would answer the call to arms. There is even a strong probability that the more conservative elements of the Federation of Labor would support him. Such a momentum has already been created by these events that it will be very much more difficult for the Conference, at its July 4 convention, and for the progressive group in Congress, to avoid independent action on the presidency than to take it. Thus the previous practical situation has been reversed.

III

Two possible obstacles still make this outcome uncertain. One is the third-party convention called by various groups to meet in St. Paul on June 17. These groups are intent on launching a new national party irrespective of the action of the Republican and Democratic conventions. The political situation is such, however, that La Follette and the other progressive senators and congressmen cannot take a definite stand until the national conventions of the old parties have forced it upon them. A premature nomination would disturb this development of inevitability and create the impression that the new movement is the cause, rather than the necessary consequence of an intolerable situation. A further embarrassment is that the Minnesota group made the serious tactical blunder of admitting Communist delegates. The chief supporters of the new movement are not revolutionary, and if they became known as such they could not possibly muster much popular support. It is true that the Communist element in the June 17 convention is a minority and does not represent the attitude of the whole, but it is an exceedingly active minority and has been the chief advertiser of the convention. Furthermore, its presence will furnish just the excuse needed for the reactionary politicians to accuse the new movement, with some show of reason, of red affiliations. Yet an active campaign against the Minnesota groups by the C. P. P. A. is impossible because their rank and file are among the strongest supporters of independent political action. It now appears probable that this convention will recede sufficiently into obscurity so that the present calculations of the national political and labor leaders can survive the burden of its support. The one bit of salvage in this situation is that it makes it easier for the Gompers element in the unions to join with the Conference for Progressive Political Action.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Another obstacle is the growing possibility that the Democrats will nominate Alfred E. Smith. Smith would have vigorous opponents in the Conference on both the religious and the prohibition issues, but it is difficult to imagine the more conservative unionists breaking away from an old party affiliation when offered the leadership of a man with Smith's personality and record. It is certain that La Follette, even if he were nominated with Smith in the field, could make little impression on the labor and progressive vote in New York, New Jersey and other eastern states. Of course, Smith's chances of election might be increased by the formation of a new party which would sap Republican strength in the Northwest. Whether this prospect would be strong enough to decide the action of the Conference is at present unpredictable. At any rate, it is still expected by the leaders of the new movement that the McAdoo and Smith candidates will cancel each other and result in a colorless compromise. For Ralston there is no enthusiasm anywhere among the progressives, and the nomination of Cox or Underwood would not produce the slightest hesitation on their part.

GEORGE SOULE.

From London to Washington

THE French poet who said with finality that to part was to die a little left no record of his impressions on returning. Yet it is at least conceivable that on his return he found repatriation also had a slight mortuary significance. Certainly for the American returning from London to Washington at this juncture the contrast in national capitals has its own challenge.

Naturally as a "hundred percenter" speaking to "hundred percenters" I would indignantly reject the suspicion that my words imply that one does anything better over there. No; emphatically no, but, what might happen if we did over here, did it now, what they have already done over there? And is it conceivable, just barely conceivable that, in this year of Grace we may yet do—better of course if at all—what they have now done in those British Islands?

For consider, after all, what they have actually done. Here one still speaks with bated breath of the British Revolution, of that red sunset over the crumbling walls of the ancient British edifice, Moscow calling to London and calling not quite in vain, Trotsky to Ramsay MacDonald, with Soviets forming in Downing Street, there is the picture to keep babies awake nights!

Such an interpretation, however simple and satisfying, unhappily misses one fact in the British Revolution, perhaps the essential fact. It is not difficult to see why such an interpretation would be insisted upon almost passionately by the American politician, but can the politician quite avail to establish, fortify, maintain the interpretation? There is the question.

For, laying aside principles, platforms, programs, examine just one aspect of the British Revolution: Two parties, ancient, respectable, traditional, deriving from a past which defies exploration, led by men approved by every canon of the protocol, sustained by all the sacred precepts of an unwritten Constitution and an inviolable practice have been suddenly, violently, enthusiastically cast forth into the outer darkness. Without warning the skies fell upon them who were the pillars of the firmament and the earth which they possessed rose under their feet and flung them upon their faces. Yesterday they were more than gods, they were the necessary men and today—they are nothing, less than nothing for without them the earth still turns impiously on its axis.

Interpret the British Revolution as you will, economically, historically, philosophically, every traveller must carry his own yardstick, but at least do not miss the enormous human fact, that the British people, millions of them, seemingly as by inspiration, suddenly as mobs do, awoke to the fact that the conviction, the faith that the British Empire rested upon twin pillars, two political parties, equally inevitable was only a delusion, not only a joke but a joke reversible at their will.

Faced with the empty and eternal dilemma of two discredited parties, invited to make the traditional and meaningless choice, the British voters deliberately chose a third. It was a solution so simple that no one had ever thought of it before, so revolutionary that it quite took the breath away from both sets of political leaders. For generations this British elector had wandered down a narrow alley walled on one side by Tory battlements and on the other by Liberal fences, broken glass on the tops of both, the alley leading nowhere in particular. Then of a sudden a shoulder, millions of shoulders are thrust against one wall and then against the other and down they go in a heap, the daylight comes in. There is the British Revolution or at least so much of it as might have immediate American application.

You must see the British elector as he was this time four or five months ago. Think of the long succession of Liberal and Tory ministries stretching back into that night of time which was the Victorian age. Always the same alternative offered him. Let him choose one from two, or, when the failure of both cried to Heaven, then a coalition in which he had no choice. Think of this elector over endless years patiently, then with imposed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

passivity and finally with unmistakable sullenness enduring this double damnation until, out of the blue, suddenly, without previous warning a third way appears.

Did the British elector read the Labor platform, accept Capital Levy, go "all out" for nationalization of Key Industries? Perhaps, I doubt it. Did he read speeches, absorb doctrine, ultimately adopt with the zeal of the convert? At least it may be questioned. Did he rather, instinctively lay hold on a Heaven-sent half brick, right at his feet, perceiving as by inspiration that two pot hats were in line of fire, might be bashed by a single shot? Did he succumb to the temptation as irresistible as that of the frog in the pond for the small boy with the new air gun, the frog who insolently and beyond harm has challenged days and nights without end?

But you must also consider the British elector's revenge in all its grandeur. Having to choose between Stanley Baldwin and Herbert H. Asquith, the latter attended by David Lloyd George, he did not merely choose the Right Honorable Ramsay MacDonald. His Revolution was not attended by the guillotine circumstance. Not at all, its victims were sentenced not to the scaffold but to hard labor. They were condemned to spend anxious days and tormented nights keeping the abhorrent third party in power. There is the supreme jest of the British elector.

For this was what, in effect, the British voter said to his old masters: "Go you to Westminster and sustain the Labor government, put it in power, keep it in power, for, if you turn it out, then I will send it back with a clear majority of its own and you will become the actual minority." That is why on one day Stanley Baldwin interposes to sustain the shaken Labor ministry and on the next Mr. Asquith flies to its rescue. That is why although the party press thunders and the American press echoes, Mr. MacDonald does not fall and the British elector continues to smile. He has waited a long time for this day but just ask him and you will perceive he regards it as worth the wait. That is why, when his own press and that of his Dominions and of the American relative inveigh against Revolution, Soviet invasion of Downing Street, etc., he smiles, rather broadly and hastens to the Cup Finals.

Wherefore, having for a moment touched this British episode, the returning traveller is condemned to wonder again: Is it conceivable, just conceivable that despite immigration laws and all other barrages physical and intellectual, the contagion of this British example might penetrate America in this interesting year? Between two parties might the not unharassed American elector also choose a third? The spectacle of all the old leaders, the necessary men of both parties working desperately and without hope of reward, not to stay in power, not to get into office, but to keep in office the enemy, the upstart, the unspeakable, lest a new affliction of popular wrath fall upon themselves—is it not appealing in all its simplicity, this British episode?

And, after all, shall we still say that the British cannot see a joke?

FRANK H. SIMONDS.

The Ohio Gang

II. The Prologue to 1920

THIS is the second in a series of articles on the origins of "the Ohio gang," how it got to Washington in 1921 and what it did there. It is being written, of course, before the first article has appeared in print; but I can look forward a few days and see the stack of letters which will be on my desk shortly after that first article reaches the readers of the New Republic.

They will be letters of protest, letters from Ohio. I shall be told that my picture of conditions in Ohio political life is much too gloomy. As an offset to such control of the large cities by corrupt bosses as I have described, correspondents will cite the reorganization of the state government in simplified and efficient form. They will applaud the excellent work in recent years of such organizations as the Ohio League of Women Voters. Going further back they will mention "Golden Rule" Jones and Tom Johnson of the three-cent fare; or Henry T. Hunt who, first as District Attorney and afterward as Mayor of Cincinnati, conducted against Boss Cox and his crew one of the most brilliant battles for reform ever recorded in American public life.

I am far from denying that there are many good things in Ohio's political history, especially during the past two decades. As in every other state, honorable men and women have fought there for decency. The side of the angels is never without some representatives; and part of the time they win. But if you are interested as I am in the history of one group of machine politicians you must admit as you study the record that the activities of the reformers seem to affect their careers very little. From time to time they are beaten, but they are almost never disorganized. When they are turned out of office, in municipality or state, they bide their time against the next election. That next election, they discovered long ago, always comes; and by the time it does, the reformers have usually lost the moral indignation which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was their binding material. Dissension splits the ranks of the honest and upright; while the monarchical form of government in the machine insures discipline and unity. Make all the exceptions you like; and you must still agree, I think, that the history of Ohio for fifty years past is a history of government of, by and for the machine.

It is impossible, of course, to recite that history in detail within the limits of a magazine article; but I can perhaps indicate by a chronological summary those of the high lights which are necessary to our purpose.

Ohio, you remember, has four chief cities. Near the northeast corner of the state is Cleveland and further west is Toledo. Columbus, the state capital, is almost in the centre of the commonwealth, and Cincinnati in the southwest corner. Not far northwest of Columbus lies the little city of Marion; and about the same distance to the southwest is a small town called Washington Court House. It was in the last-named community that Harry M. Daugherty, in 1881, began the practice of law. Three years later, in 1884, Warren G. Harding, then only nineteen years old, bought the Marion Star for $300, rather more than it was then worth. It had been started a short time before by an itinerant drug-peddling "doctor" and consisted chiefly of liabilities.

It was during the Blaine campaign in that same year, as I have said, that George B. Cox, destined to be the most notorious boss in America, first emerged into public view. In 1884, also, John R. McLean, owner of the Cincinnati Enquirer which he had inherited from his father, Washington McLean, celebrated the arrival in the world of an heir whom he named Edward B.

In 1885, J. B. Foraker was elected governor of Ohio on the Republican ticket. As in so many others in Ohio history, grave frauds were perpetrated in this election. In this instance they were in Cincinnati and the Democrats were chiefly guilty. Foraker was reëlected in 1887; but was defeated in 1889, when some of his supporters forged a document accusing James E. Campbell his Democratic opponent, of owning an interest in a new type of ballot box which he was urging Congress to adopt. The charge proved a boomerang and Campbell was elected.

Cox was now in full career in Cincinnati and his reign already so corrupt that Campbell's first act after succeeding the complaisant Foraker in office was to call a special session of the State Legislature to consider "the deplorable condition of public affairs" in Cincinnati. A law was passed creating a new and badly needed Board of Public Improvements for the city; but the Ohio Supreme Court, which has repeatedly proved the willing tool of corruption, declared it unconstitutional.

In 1890, Daugherty achieved his first and last distinction at the suffrage of his fellow citizens. He was elected to the Ohio House of Representatives where he served until 1894. The next job he adorned, twenty-seven years later, was an appointive one: that of U. S. Attorney-General.

The often-repeated story that Harding and Daugherty were lifelong friends is false. They met, it is true, while both young men. The occasion was a political gathering at a school-house. Let history record the fact that Daugherty, seeking a drink of water, discovered the future President out by the pump washing his shoes. After that meeting, however, there followed years of only casual acquaintance until in 1910 Harding ran unsuccessfully for governor. Daugherty opposed him in the party councils at that time; but they grew to know each other better, by 1912 they were good friends, and in 1914 the lawyer directed the editor's successful senatorial campaign. Even after that, in 1917, they had a bitter quarrel; it was patched up at a "love feast" arranged by mutual friends, in time to permit Daugherty to head the delegation which in 1919 persuaded Harding to become a presidential candidate.

But for a long time, prior to about 1904, the strands in our story, afterward so closely interwoven, hardly touch one another. Here you see Harding in Marion, publishing his paper and making it bigger and better, and meanwhile building up a place for himself in state politics as a good reliable organization man with no troublesome notions of his own. Here you see Daugherty, first in Washington Court House and afterward in Columbus, practicing law and playing politics, increasingly important as lobbyist and political fixer, even though for years he was persona non grata to the three chief figures in the Republican machine—Mark Hanna, Foraker and Cox. Here in Washington Court House you see Jesse Smith, Daugherty's unnoticed, humble friend, running his little dry goods and furnishings store, which gets bigger as the years go by. Here you see Howard Manington, first an orphan in the Soldiers' Home at Xenia, then country editor in several little towns, finally lobbyist and hanger-on at the state capitol. The destiny which was to draw these four men together so disastrously had not yet revealed itself; only the common self-interest which tied them all at the tail of one common cart: the Ohio state machine of the Republican party.

In 1897 Howard Manington was appointed assistant Secretary of State. He held the post four years, failing at the end of that time in an effort to secure the Secretaryship itself. Daugherty, by 1901, had some power in state politics, and Manington was officially his candidate. But Mark Hanna, then at the height of his power as Republican dictator not only for Ohio but for the nation, disliked and distrusted Daugherty. Two years previously he had refused the Columbus lawyer the Republican nomination for governor; and now with equally direct efficiency he destroyed Manington's candidacy. The latter thereupon disappeared from public view until 1906, when he was made secretary of the State Railroad Commission.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meanwhile, the editor of the Marion Star was continuing his steady climb in the Republican organization. The state machine was by no means a peaceful band of brothers. It was shaken by terrific internal quarrels, though these were usually patched up at election time. There was the feud between Daugherty and Hanna, already referred to; there was hostility between Daugherty and the Cox-Foraker crowd. There were bitter antagonisms between Theodore Burton and Boss Cox, between Foraker and John Sherman, and elsewhere. Harding managed, as a rule, to avoid being committed to either side in these quarrels. From the beginning he showed a placatory, conciliatory temperament. He sought to be a good friend of as many people as possible; and, despite the popular supposition that carrying water on both shoulders is impossible, he succeeded in it surprisingly well.

In 1904, we find him selected to present to the State Republican Convention the names of the four nominees for delegates-at-large to the National Convention—"The Big Four," Ohio nicknamed them. These four men were Joseph B. Foraker, Mark Hanna, Charles Dick and George B. Cox. Harding's speech went about as far in laudation of the notorious Cincinnati boss as anyone could very well go. "He is," said Harding, "a peerless leader, to whom everyone owes deference and devotion." Ohio remembers that speech to this day; the editor's enemies used it against him in the Senatorial campaign of 1914. But if it brought him the hostility of the good, it gained him the friendship of the wicked. From that time forth the Marion editor and the Cincinnati boss were close political allies.

In 1904, Harding was completing his fourth year in the Ohio State Senate. By this time Harry Daugherty was a familiar figure in Ohio political life and a frequent visitor to the halls of the State Capitol. The senator and the attorney frequently met there; and both of them had occasion to see something of Howard Manington. In the year mentioned, Harding stepped from the State Senate into the post of Lieutenant-Governor. His chief was Myron T. Herrick, an amiable and good-looking gentleman, obviously born for the post he subsequently occupied as Ambassador to France.

Now comes the era of The Great Eclipse in Ohio. From about 1906 until 1914 the Republican machine was on the defensive. In 1906 John M. Pattison, a Democrat and a "dry" was elected governor. What promised to be a career of useful service was cut short by his death three months later. In 1910 Harding was defeated as Republican candidate for governor. Judson Harmon, his successful Democratic opponent, was reëlected two years later.

There were several reasons for this situation. The corruption which existed in several places under Republican bosses by this time had been rather thoroughly aired. The first five years of this period (1906-11) saw the brilliant attack on Boss Cox in Cincinnati by Henry T. Hunt and his associates, with the public revelation that Cox had pocketed at least half the boodle in several flagrant instances of graft.

Of importance, also, was the failure of the Ohio machine to understand or adjust itself to the dominant national policies of Roosevelt. Progressivism, with its corollary of honest administration, meant and could mean nothing at all to men of the Daugherty type. They invariably regard the control of city, state or national government as the divinely appointed perquisite of themselves and their friends. Even when as sometimes happens they are not personally dishonest, they connive at the dishonesty of others, they consent to archaic, wasteful methods, padded payrolls and other needless expenditures. The notion that large business enterprises ought in the popular interest to be controlled and restricted seems a monstrous fallacy to those who look upon the directors of these enterprises as benevolent patrons. The machine men can never be expected to understand the Roosevelt of the trust-busting days; and it is not surprising that while his star was in the ascendency theirs waned very low indeed. Neither is it surprising to find that when the great split occurred in 1912 the editor of the Marion Star was to be found marching lockstep with the Old Guard. No more bitter denunciations of Roosevelt and all that he stood for ever appeared in print than the campaign editorials in the Star.

By 1914, however, Progressivism was only an historical incident. In that year, as I have already recorded, Harding ran for Senator and was elected. He did so as the protegé of Daugherty, by then a much more important individual than himself in Ohio politics.

There followed six years which from the point of view of our little chronology were comparatively unimportant. Harding, in the Senate, remained careful, conservative, a reliable member of the national machine as he had been of its Ohio branch. Back at home Daugherty was mending his fences, making alliances, preparing in the numerous ways which are part of the technique of professional politics, for the campaign of 1920.

For our present purposes there is no need to consider the stories which have been heard lately, to the effect that Harding's nomination was bought and paid for by the oil interests. For the situation with which we are concerned is far broader and more important than that involved in the direct bribery of a few officials by any single group of business men.

The Republicans had been out of office for eight lean and hungry years. Now they knew they could win. All over the world they saw the governments which had carried on the war swept out of power one after another on a tide of accumulated resentment of the incidental hardships which the conflict produced. Politicians are sometimes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

constrained to assume a virtue when they have it not, in order to succeed; but in 1920 the Republicans were permitted the luxury of exhibiting themselves in their natural colors.

What happened? The machine selected a man conspicuously unfit in character, in wisdom, in lifelong associations, to be the President of the United States. In the small-town publisher, proposed as the organization candidate, sponsored by a "regular" politician, it found a man who could be relied upon to do the machine's business; to be "one of the boys;" to stand by complaisantly while his colleagues resumed their old-time liaison with the country's big commercial and financial institutions.

I do not assert that the leaders of the Republican national machine contemplated any such operation as Fall's affair with Doheny. To suppose that they did seems to me an interpretation too naïvely simple to fit the facts of human nature. The party rulers do not deal in bribery. Their methods are more subtle and on the whole more effective than that. Fall was a piker; and the machine politicians are not pikers. What, for instance, is a hundred thousand dollars in cash compared to the hundreds of millions which may be saved by a reduction in surtaxes, most of which will go into good Republican pockets, part of which will find its way into Republican campaign chests, national, state and local, and all of which will help to strengthen the already strong bonds of mutual interests?

The party in 1920, therefore, planned and executed what I think can only be described as a great betrayal of the interests of good government. They took advantage, in order to do so, of the spiritual exhaustion of a country which had passed through the successive emotional crises of the war. It is the fashion, I know, to say that the election of 1920 registered a majority of 7,000,000 against the League of Nations; and never, in my opinion, was worse nonsense uttered. There were, certainly, some votes against the League. There were some votes against Woodrow Wilson, partly actuated by the same principles which caused the Athenians to exile Aristides, tired of hearing him called The Just. There were some votes by German-Americans, angry over the loss of the war and the terms of the peace. There were votes by Irish-Americans who suspected Wilson of too great cordiality toward Great Britain. There were votes by people who had been forced to buy Liberty Bonds, by people who had suffered from the operations of the draft, by people who resented wartime restrictions on business, by people angry over the high cost of living. If one must have a sweeping generalization, it would be fairest to say that the vote in 1920 was a vote against War; since War was responsible for most of the multitude of grievances there exhibited.

Such post-mortems as these, however, are somewhat beside the point. The Republican machine scored a victory with its hand-picked candidate. Three years later its leaders found themselves forced to admit that the complaisance on which they had counted had gone further than even they had contemplated. The story of those three years I shall attempt to sketch in a subsequent article.

BRUCE BLIVEN.

(Note: This is the second of a series of articles, of which the third will appear in an early issue.)

Defending the Citadel of Freedom

ON June 7 next the Capitol at Washington will be the scene of a unique—and much advertised—occasion. In the presence of Congress, Mr. Coolidge himself presiding, seven high school students, from as many sections of the country, will compete for the grand prize in the "National Oratorical Contest on the Constitution." Meanwhile a million students are participating in some degree, studying about the Constitution, writing papers, delivering orations, competing for a share of the quarter million dollars in prizes.

What is behind the scenes in this stupendous drama? Is it "just pure, unadulterated, loyal, patriotic Americanism," as a writer in the World's Work calls it "a genuinely unselfish contribution on the part of newspaper publishers toward better citizenship?" Or is it, in the language of the Sacramento Bee, "camouflaged and poisonous propaganda, . . . part of a systematized, organized and well financed campaign to instill into the minds of the young people the idea that the initiative, referendum and recall are un-American?" Is it an attempt to "slay all liberal and progressive thoughts," or do its critics, on the contrary, merit this caustic and truly classic comment of the Los Angeles Times: "The polecat, no doubt, looks anxiously out upon the world, hoping that everything else will smell bad. Just so there are journalists of small soul who maliciously spray the decent and good things of life with stench."

Let the reader judge for himself from this unvarnished tale of the origin of the contest.

Somewhat over a year ago, there appeared before the board of education in Los Angeles representatives of a so-called Committee of One Hundred proposing to conduct in the junior and senior high schools an oratorical contest on the Constitution. Heading the committee was Mr. Harry Chandler, owner of the Los Angeles Times, which is noted for its hostility to organized labor, and regarded by scores of thousands as a most sinister

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

element in our civic life. Another prominent member was one Harry Haldeman, president of the Better America Federation. To this organization a "Better America" means an America safe for the open shop. It is the body which attempted to distribute among the high schools of California a reactionary pamphlet entitled America is Calling, and which recently has been sending a "reformed" Socialist, Miss Hermine Schwed, to lecture about the dangers of radicalism to the women's clubs of the city—to what effect may be judged from an item in The Bandwagon in the New Republic for March 26. Most of the other members of the committee were well known for their conservative and anti-labor views.

This precious committee proposed to conduct a contest "to increase respect for the Constitution" among the high schools of Southern California. They offered, to facilitate the work of the students, to place in the hands of each one a copy of a book about to be published called The Constitution: The Citadel of Freedom. The subjects assigned for the contest were the same as the chapter headings in the book. Its author, Mr. Randolph Leigh, was a young Columbia graduate employed on the Times.

Suspicious that under the cloak of studying the Constitution might be masked an attack on certain features of the California state constitution, and aware that "respect for the Constitution" in the minds of some people is synonymous with unreasoning worship of the god of things as they are, the liberal members of the board were on their guard. They read the galley proofs of Mr. Leigh's book, and found that it did attack direct legislation, that it contained numerous historical inaccuracies, and that it made contemptuous and derogatory references to Jefferson. Its short bibliography included Beard's Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy, but not his Economic Interpretation of the Constitution. It gave equal prominence to Back to the Republic, an unconsciously humorous booklet by Harry F. Atwood, then managing director of the B. A. F., whose thesis is that democracy is as vicious as autocracy, and that the republic, as conceived by the fathers, is a standard form of government, suited alike to "darkest Africa, densest China, chivalrous France," and numerous other variously adjectived countries.

So the board refused the generous offer to have the book distributed to every student, but agreed on condition that the derogatory references to Jefferson be eliminated to have the book placed in the libraries where it could be used or not as the students desired, and where its influence might be counteracted by other books not so partisan. Under these conditions it was agreed that the contest should be allowed.

Considerable interest was aroused in the contest among the students. The offer of district prizes of $50 and a grand prize of $1,500 was quite an incentive. The prizes, it later transpired, were donated by Mr. Chandler. The judges being selected by the committee, it was well understood by the students that they would be almost wholly of the conservative type. As a result of the mere desire to win, intensified by the mercenary motive of the money prize, the known bias of the judges led numbers of students to the writer's personal knowledge, either somewhat to color or greatly to disguise their honest convictions. A judge at one of the local contests (a member of the committee) advised the winner to modify certain too liberal portions of his speech in order to "get by" with the judges in the final. And there is reason to suspect that more than one oration entered for the contest was partly or even largely the work of older people.

A similar competition was conducted among university students. At the final contest at the University of Southern California, the Stanford contestant, Robert E. Lewis, made a splendid appeal for a liberal attitude toward the Constitution, citing the "red hysteria" exemplified in the criminal syndicalism laws as evidence of a tendency to depart from the spirit that wrote into the Constitution the Bill of Rights. He pleaded for a return to sanity. His oration made a profound impression on his audience, many of whom felt that he deserved first place. Not so the judges, who marked him sixth.

Evidently the promoters of the contest felt encouraged by the results. Believing, quite sincerely, of course, that they are saving the nation from going headlong to a red perdition, and that the way to keep the young generation in the straight and narrow path of the political and economic faith of their fathers, is to get them all to studying the Constitution, they planned to repeat the contest this year, and extend it to the whole nation. The soil had been well prepared. Throughout the country, through the efforts of the American Bar Association and such "patriotic" organizations as the National Security League practically identical laws had been introduced in nearly all state legislatures requiring the study of the Constitution of the United States for a certain period every school year from the eighth grade through the university. (Here in California at the instance of State Superintendent Will C. Wood, who had prevented the attempted distribution of America is Calling on the ground of partisanship, the extreme rigidity of the bill was modified, so that the law as it was finally passed is quite commendable.) Besides, other contests had been carried on in various parts of the country, some, like that in California, under the auspices of newspapers. It was therefore not a difficult thing to get the coöperation of over two hundred newspapers and to raise a fund of hundreds of thousands for prizes, advertising, overhead, and other expenses.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having had experience with the contest here last year, the teachers in California were in a position to insist on certain changes in the contest's conduct which will remove some of the grounds for criticism. When this criticism of last year's contest was voiced at a meeting of the Oral Arts Association in Los Angeles, Mr. A. F. Blanks, of the University of Southern California, now on leave of absence to manage the contest for this "zone," frankly admitted its validity. A resolution was passed which condemned the money prize feature, urging that scholarships be substituted, if possible, and vigorously insisted on the elimination of partisanship and on some insurance against plagiarism. Mr. Blanks explained that it was too late to eliminate the prizes, but promised that the other conditions would be fully met. When Superintendent Wood was approached to secure an indorsement of the contest he made some trenchant suggestions concerning the books to be recommended and the method of choosing judges, and made it clear that "any attempt to use the contest for an attack on [the initiative, referendum, and recall] would be challenged as partisan." This statement the Times characteristically distorted into an indorsement of the contest itself, in language that seems intentionally misleading: "The one feature of the orations —that they increase respect for the Constitution— Wood cordially indorses *as* he points out that partisanship and propaganda . . . can not . . . be tolerated in the schools." [Italics mine. Mr. Wood's meaning would have been expressed by *but*.]

It is only fair to state that Mr. Blanks is apparently doing his best to insure against legitimate ground for criticism. Yet outside of California it is apparent that the same insidious partisanship which we found here last year may be expected. The directing head of the national contest is Mr. Leigh. His book even with the changes suggested by the Los Angeles board of education is styled a distinctly partisan book by Superintendent Wood, who insists that it be not featured in California. But elsewhere newspapers sponsoring the contest are printing the book in full in their columns. And in California students are using it more freely than other books, since numerous copies are available, while more scholarly and less biassed books are hard to get hold of. In the list of topics a concession has been made to the Democrats by including Jefferson and the Constitution. But Mr. Leigh doubtless feels toward Jefferson as he did when he wrote the book.

Yet when all is said and done, the contest will undoubtedly do more good than harm. Any attempt of conservatives to capitalize patriotism and respect for the Constitution is sure to react against them. Such a dramatic propaganda effort as an oratorical contest on a national scale, with a grand finale at Washington, will challenge the attention of liberals as well as conservatives. Nor can students make a serious study of the Constitution—whatever they may say to win a prize—without sensing that it is a very human document, not a fetich, the product not of verbal inspiration but of the economic and social conditions out of which it came. They cannot read the Bill of Rights—however they may soft-pedal it in an oration—without getting some stir of the liberal thought that produced it, and without wondering about our present tendency to disregard it.

Who knows but what in their desire to perpetuate the status quo, our friends the conservatives may have overreached themselves, and that our youth, far more rational than their tradition-bound elders, may through their study of the Constitution become the means of keeping it alive by progressive adaptation to the needs of a changing world? Is it not likely that they will perceive that it is not the written word, but the spirit of the people that constitutes our "Citadel of Freedom?"

WILLIS T. NEWTON.

Los Angeles, California.

The Ghost of Art in the Movies

THE movies have been led astray for a long time by what, for want of a better term, is called art.

In bulk, the movies will always be an escape into love, limousines and rewarded virtue for persons whose lives run along the correct side of the primrose hedge. But in the past, composers for whom motion picture counterpoint has become an unconscious process, have wanted to break the habitual pattern of movie morality, and cast a votive offering before the altar of art. Generally they have been led astray by the experts outside the fold, who have declared that motion picture art must depend entirely for effectiveness on those formal and mechanical elements of lighting, design and composition, which have been borrowed from the arts of design or else have been taken over from the theatre.

At times the critic who has borrowed the jargon of the painter has stumbled on some part of the esthetik of motion in his analysis of abstract elements of visual motion—relationships of line and masses. But the critic has seldom penetrated the shell of abstraction to the reason for abstraction, the need of a vigorous connotation of human ideas in basic forms of motion. The dynamics of form in motion drama cannot successfully exist for its own sake. It can be significant only as it draws power from the secret springs of life.

The vague belief of the producer that he could

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make money out of "art" and the public's indiscriminate response has kept the movie pretentious, inflated and insincere; the wisdom of the false prophets has led the "artistic" movie deeply into the forests of buncombe, leaving a trail of inanity behind it. The still current preoccupation with the resources of photography—soft focus, color, painter's composition—has added little, except in rare instances such as, for example, The Ten Commandments, to the contemporary puerility of a thousand photoplays.

From these dozen or more years of experiment and blind effort has come however a kind of concerted decision among motion drama creators to take for granted now these avenues of mechanical approach, to turn back again to life—vast common ground—and surprise humanity in the act of being itself, in all the illogic and absurdity of its varying patterns.

Although Chaplin is at this moment the most conspicuous example of this tendency, he is by no means the revolutionist he might seem to be. Neilan, Lubitsch, von Stroheim, and in some respects William de Mille, have been originators as much as Chaplin, lacking only the comedian's intuitive philosophic understanding of his medium and his ability to refine these effects, to sharpen them out of mere representation into high dramatic significance. Of these, some have brought a sophisticated viewpoint to their performance; others have had at least the gamin's attitude toward the material of life.

What they have accomplished is important only for the movies; measured by the other arts, it is only an historical development, comparable to the same progress in the Broadway theatre between 1910 and the present. Yet movement of this kind in the movies has awaited for years that sophisticated person who would take the trouble to become aware of the technical processes of the screen, and then be sufficiently Aladdin or Croesus to gamble on his desires.

It has slowly dawned upon the screen composer that only one fact is important in making movies —the unimportance of plot. The tendency to make the screen like the stage has never completely disappeared; indeed at this moment most movies disclose the same classic development of plot and action that marks the theatre from Racine, through Sardou, Ibsen, Pinero and George Cohan. All of this occurs very strangely at a time when the stage drama borrows continuousness from the moving picture and produces the drama of expressionism.

The most distressing and fatiguing movies are those built upon highly complicated plot. The reason is as much philosophic as mechanical. The essence of plot is casual relationship—efforts impinging upon causes—and a successful illusion of life, especially in a time when the illusion of life is so completely a picture of accident and incoherence, can never be produced by a method which provides for accident only by such apparent design. But mechanical reasons are no less important. The movie, which is a progression in time—a becoming like music—differs from music to the extent that without words, as pure pantomimic motion, it cannot summarize a theme. It must be pressing on and on urgently to hold visual attention taut. Once this motion slackens pace, attention goes. This speed of movement, this anderstreben toward a fusing of form and matter, is at its best with simple dramatic elements; at its worst when movement is complicated by the number of thematic threads that are to be carried.

The new technique that seems to be emerging today takes as a core a simple idea of potential power and develops it in a progressing, related series of pictures, each sequence a highly concentrated focus of human character in movement. What appears on the screen by this method tends to become packed with human connotations. Adolphe Menjou, in Chaplin's A Woman of Paris, after a violent evening quarrel with his mistress, goes to his rich apartment and is disclosed in bed, reading La Vie Parisienne and eating apples. All this is sardonic, pictured with a light thrust at the hypocrisies and at the vanities of life. But while the intention is modern, close to the laughter of the time, the method is modern as well. This elimination of everything except characters, forms and pantomimes that have definite meanings is as much a method for a new realistic panorama of life as it is for satire. In the new approach, scenes that pad the story, establish motives and background at great length, are conspicuously absent. Relation of scene to scene, continuity, is implicit in the material; the audience's imagination, stimulated by the condensation of meaning, is trusted to understand all that has gone before and will come after.

This is close to the method of all modern art, which packs a multitude of meanings into a few significant symbols—inheritors of an entire civilized consciousness. Yet in the motion picture, the task of selection is peculiarly difficult. In the novel at its best, a sheer enumeration of facts sometimes takes on intellectual meaning. The panorama of things, ideas and memories in Ulysses is highly interpretative of a kind of life. But the novel has always to its aid words—symbols highly impregnated with meaning, the thousand attenuations and reverberations of human history. Appearance somehow lacks this connotative power, unless it is highly selected, condensed, organized and related to ideas. What the drama of motion needs most, as it always has needed, is first rate imaginations that are trained to speak in the symbols of the new language—gifted to rob appearance of its inanity, and to provide it with semblance and with resemblance.

The early motion picture was always at its best

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as a spectacle. Pure visual motion of people and things over simple stretches of space filled most honestly and adequately the boundaries of this new art form as far as it had been explored. The drama of intimate spaces has been a bastard offspring of the theatre and the novel. Now that it can work on a smaller canvas, the new motion picture approaches more and more the state of music and poetry; not in the popular sense of a vague evocation of beauties, but in a clear, sharp, definitive projection of living essences. Only in music of all the other arts will an audience be able to partake of the whole of experience, as in a microcosm, so completely and with such immediacy as in the drama of motion—once it finally arrives at the heights toward which it now seems to be set.

RALPH BLOCK.

CORRESPONDENCE

Why the Progressives Are Ineffective

SIR: I have long been a reader of your valuable publication and have been glad of the breath of fresh air it provides us in the generally stagnant atmosphere of American journalism.

There is however one thing that becomes increasingly clear to me as I read your discussions of third-party movements and similar things and watch the course of progressivism in this country in recent years.

Do not the progressives lack an issue, a real rallying point; and is not the cause of their invariable failure in recent times that they lack one great thought to hang on to? The progressive party in 1912 proposed some good steps,—but steps towards what? What was the great social vision that guided them? I never saw any and I doubted their success from the start. Men cannot be enthused to followership simply by a number of rather incoherent practical propositions, generally labelled liberal. In spite of all, men must feel that these propositions mean movement towards a new dispensation of some kind, call it whatever you may.

I think there is, or ought to be, general disgust in this country with the way our government is being run, and I think this is true whether specific charges can be proved or not. The *spirit* of the whole thing is wrong. From the President down there hardly seems to be a man in politics today, who is there for any great constructive effort of any kind. They all are there for the "job," or for the "game," or for the "graft," or to "keep business going," but certainly not to move the American people forward towards those higher and better things, for which the great mass of us in spite of all yearn.

Let it be clear that a great new party stands unreservedly for the happiness of the many, that it means to work for this, no matter how its efforts will be labelled. Let it gather figures and facts and information from all the world to prove that the ideal it stands for is humanly possible, and I think it will find followers. The National Bureau of Economic Research has proved that the major part of the nation's industrial income goes to the workers. The Committee on Waste of the national engineering societies has however also proved that our industries are only fifty percent efficient. Let a national party declare that it means to further every effort to make the industries more productive, provided the major part of the increased products will go to the workers. Let it declare that gambling in the people's commodities must stop. Let it declare that the industries are responsible for the support of the people engaged in them in slack times no less than in booming times. Let it declare for the broad principle that no man shall derive a profit from activities which do not contribute to the people's health and happiness.

As general and vague as these things may be, I think what we need most at this time is to unite around some such great fundamental principles. Once these are recognized, reforms will flow automatically. At present even the most salutary and conservative reforms are drowned in a rubbish of old ideas, over which the watchdogs of special privilege stand zealous guard.

C. A. NORMAN.

Columbus, Ohio.

Third-Party Courage

SIR: In an article which appeared in your columns a few weeks ago you apply the brake to third-party enthusiasms, as I remember, on the ground that many progressives interested in the movement are enjoying, or may sometime enjoy, secure positions with one or other of the older parties, which positions would be forfeited by rebellious conduct on their part, and thus, in the event of the new party failing to materialize, leave them homeless wanderers. Your advice seemed to imply a somewhat peculiar attitude toward the virtue known as courage of convictions, and I was relieved to find in your issue of yesterday some more cogent reasons for cautious inactivity. Unfortunately your new arguments seem to embody some very disquieting elements. You emphasize the want of a preliminary program, and the discredit that would fall on the progressives if they gained office and did not know how to make proper use of it.

The progressives certainly labor under the disadvantage of having had no experience of office. Their constructive work so far has been mainly a matter of ideals, ideas or words. But has it not been the same with every progressive movement since the world began? Is it not the disadvantage of youth itself? And does not the supreme test of moral courage come precisely when there arrives an opportunity of adapting those air castles to actuality?

Turning to British politics we can find the case fairly well paralleled. When the opportunity came to Ramsay MacDonald he had the best case for hypothetical failure a pessimistic statesman could desire. He lacked experience. He had no majority. He had no workable program before the country. His followers were mostly helpless with hesitation. The country, as far as one could tell, did not expect that Labor had the slightest contribution to make to the science of good government. But MacDonald calmly took his opportunity and promptly won a confidence at home and abroad that was nothing less than phenomenal. MacDonald had courage, and he had his principles, and his principles tallied in important respects with the principles of the country as a whole. Could we have a better example of the fact that high principles, given a start in a favorable soil, will grow amazingly in defiance of all probability?

Now is the leader whom the progressives may choose likely to be in worse case than MacDonald? Would he not have principles, capacity and courage equal to almost anything the older parties can offer? Moreover, are there not principles in the country at large crying for expression, which the older parties seem unable to express, and which the progressives believe they can? What sound reason can there be then for expecting that such a leader, faced for the first time with actual office, would fail to rise to the occasion? And even supposing he did, would there not be, after four or eight years of progressive interregnum such a reshuffling of men and ideas that the two old parties could not stand the remotest chance of settling back into their present unfortunate condition?

I still hope to see the New Republic abandon its rôle as a purveyor of doubts to assume its legitimate post at the head of a sane, courageous and high-principled progressivism.

HENRY J. SOWERBY.

North Prescott, Massachusetts.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Japanese in California

SIR: In current discussions of the problem of the Japanese in California, several matters have been misunderstood, and others perversely stated.

Those of us opposed to Anti-Alien Legislation are for the most part not in favor of admission of Asiatic laborers. Our interest is in fair treatment of those legally here, and in honorable and friendly conduct on the part of our own nation. Most of our Japanese farm-laborers came to California on the annexation of Hawaii. They had been brought to Hawaii by American sugar interests before the Japanese system of compulsory schools had been established. Hence they are naturally often ignorant and clannish.

It is not true, so far as known, that the Root-Takahira "Gentlemen's Agreement" has been violated even in a single case. It is moreover evident that an exclusion agreement, with Japan coöperating, is more effective than any arbitrary act could be. Some fourteen years ago Count Hayashi of the Japanese Foreign Office, for the purpose of reducing friction or criticism, ceased to issue passports to Mexico. This measure has been usually ignored by agitators in California. Having proved ineffective, it may be rescinded, in which case the much exaggerated emigration from Mexico might become a serious matter, which it is not now.

It is not true that the Japanese government is trying now, or ever has tried, to secure a foothold in California or anywhere else in America. The Magdalena Bay scare of 1912 was about as idiotic a piece of yellow journalism as could be imagined.

It is not true that agitation in California has done anything towards exclusion of Orientals, nor is it likely to drive any away, nor to reduce their number.

Something may be said for the limitation of alien landholding, provided in the act of 1913, but the referendum act of 1922 represents a dangerous policy. So long as these people are foreign citizens, they must be controlled from home through consular agents. Any act concerning them, if affecting their accepted rights, is international in nature. The international interests of the United States cannot be safely left at the mercy of haphazard local referendum. One can hardly imagine a more reckless way of dealing with international affairs. As a matter of fact, most of the 600,000 voters for the act of 1922 supposed that it concerned Japanese immigration. Two hundred thousand voted against it, and about 400,000 who had voted for state officers did not cast any ballot on this question.

The birthrate among Japanese laboring classes is high, as with Italians, Portuguese, Irish, in the same financial condition. As with all other races, it falls with the competition of other interests inside the family.

The word assimilation has two meanings—inter-breeding, and comprehension of political and social conditions. In the latter sense, the young Japanese are more readily assimilated than people of several European races; in the former (fortunately) scarcely at all, for a certain pride of ancestry makes Japanese, as a whole, averse to "mixed marriages."

That all races resident in our country should have means of becoming citizens is vital to the integrity of the nation. We should condemn no race of men to permanent outlawry, a line of policy disastrous wherever it has been tried.

DAVID STARR JORDAN.

Stanford University, California.

"Radio Fallacies"

SIR: Recently in your columns Mr. E. C. Lindeman imputed to me among others a fallacious belief in a millennium to be brought about by the radio, instancing passages from my article on Radio Politics in your issue of March 19. Since two of my brothers in error are not persons but periodicals, and the other is the Chancellor of Austria, whose reply might presumably be somewhat late in arriving, perhaps I may be permitted an immediate protest against a seeming fallacy on Mr. Lindeman's part,—the use of my words to illustrate a point of view which I do not hold, which the words themselves do not show, and the questionable validity of which my article set out to analyze. "In the interest of sanity and patience," in which Mr. Lindeman professes to be writing, may I ask him to reread my statements with the use of those qualities, and without the imaginative connotations with which his eagerness for combat has apparently endowed them.

My statement which Mr. Lindeman uses at the head of his article was as follows: "Potentially the radio gives every member of the electorate the possibility of a direct reaction to the candidates themselves. It does reproduce to some degree, for the first time in the United States, the conditions of the Athenian democracy where every voter, for himself, could hear and judge the candidates." This, to Mr. Lindeman's creative imagination, is a "prophetic utterance," an "inclusive promise of deliverance," an indication of a faith that in politics "the joyful shouts of man" are soon to be "mingled with the song of the morning stars." I can only understand such an interpretation of my words by the assumption that Mr. Lindeman is among those classicists to whom any reference to ancient Athens is tantamount to an allusion to heaven. What of course I intended and what I trust I conveyed to most readers was simply a statement of the physical fact that the potential ability of the individual voter to hear the candidates' speeches for himself produced in the United States a condition paralleled, in that particular, in the city-state of Athens. As to consequent merits or demerits in that democracy I neither expressed nor implied any opinion.

Again quoting from my article a line about the possibility of the radio's transmission of "the immediate warm reaction of the candidate's personality, down to the very creaking of his shirt studs," Mr. Lindeman comments: "The presumed superiority of the radio over the newspaper is based upon the assumption that the sense of seeing is inferior to the sense of hearing." If Mr. Lindeman will be good enough to reread my article, he will find a paragraph devoted to exactly the opposite thesis. May I also point out to him that even from my quoted statement isolated from the context no such inference can be drawn. My implied comparison between the newspaper and the radio was one of kind and not of degree. I was trying to show that the radio can contribute something *different* from the press. The hypothetical shirt studs were intended as an ultimate illustration of the kind of direct personality impressions not implicit in the words themselves, which the radio can, and the newspaper cannot, convey. For the only seeing or hearing of shirt-stud creaks that Mr. Lindeman can do in a newspaper must be through the ears of the reporter. "At this point," let us suppose that acute (and possibly partisan) person to have written, "the candidate's very shirt studs creaked with his enthusiasm." If, however, Mr. Lindeman had been using his own ears, over the radio, he might have been equally convinced that the shirt studs creaked because the candidate had forgotten his next point and was puffing in an effort to regain it. Mr. Lindeman is, I am sure, too good a scholar and too conscientious a voter not to appreciate the advantages of a personal contact with source material.

The point is too obvious, but it not only illustrates Mr. Lindeman's misinterpretation of my words but a fundamental difference in view between us. As political instruments Mr. Lindeman classes the radio and the newspaper together as "mediums of secondary communication." He nowhere defines this term, but judging by his usage, it seems to me inaccurate. The radio does make a direct connection of a sort between speaker and auditor, between candidate and voter. The newspaper too may be said to do this in so far as it furnishes exact transcripts of the candidate's speeches. But how many newspapers can afford even the space? Most papers, with some notable metropolitan exceptions, must report such speeches selectively. The process of selection involves factors of personal and political bias. Therefore it is frequently true that between the speech of the candidate and the newspaper reader there is a third person intermediary. Not only does the newspaper report lack of radio's immediacy and its conveyance of direct personality impressions apart from the words but it cannot be depended upon to give completely and accurately the words themselves. If the radio is a secondary means of communication, then the newspaper is often tertiary. But this is not to say,—please note, Mr. Lindeman,—that the newspaper has not its points of advantage.

Might I finally suggest that the discrepancy between my own mundane murmurs and their reverberations in Mr. Lindeman's ear does inspire the doubt as to whether all his singing morning stars do not belong to a specious rather than a spacious firmament.

EUNICE FULLER BARNARD.

New York City.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Barnes-Hazen Discussion

SIR: In this period when history texts for the lower schools are being denatured of critical value and held to the threadbare patriotic mythology, the *New Republic* performs yeoman service to civilization in opening its columns to the Barnes-Hazen controversy about certain college books. Probably the verbal joust will cost both of the leading contestants something, and the prestige of historians as a group may even suffer somewhat, but the real social uses of history will be served if the public sees the point.

First, it should be clear to any mind not sealed by prejudice that the question of war guilt is still debatable by honest, intelligent people. Some statesmen obviously had more to do with making the war inevitable than others, and the architects of that ghastly mess were not all of any one nation or group of nations. Most of the Allied soldiers who were our comrades, and of the opposing side whom we met as prisoners had nothing at all to do with the genesis of the war, and knew nothing of value concerning how it actually came about. What is not sufficiently emphasized in such debates as the present one is that the makers of the war, on both sides, were mostly well-meaning, affable gentlemen, following what they considered to be the line of their duty. There is nothing constructive in formulating the Great War as a ten-twenty-thirty-cent melodrama and looking excitedly for the villain.

Second, it is absurdly obvious that the admission under duress of guilt by any defeated group has no standing whatever as evidence. It would not have any even in a police court.

Third, the bearing of this attitude toward war guilt on the reparations question seems hardly less evident. If the war was connived at by some people on both sides, in an atmosphere of secrecy, belligerency and hypocrisy which made private crimes public virtues, that was the fault of all of us. It is ex post facto morality to abuse Sazonov, Berchtold or Poincaré now for acting according to the established canons of a diplomacy which we had done nothing to change then. If our hindsight is better than their foresight, the situation is not unique in human affairs.

Since the war arose from accident and human weakness as much as from anybody's "guilt;" since it is impossible to define "guilt" in this connection, and futile to attempt any apportionment of it; let us abandon this particular hypocritical abomination of the Treaty of Versailles, already repudiated by two of the "Big Four." This immediately eliminates the pension bill, never defensible on any grounds except the melodramatic hypothesis of the war. As to the rest of the "reparations" bill, the logical thing would be to divide the reconstruction expenses among the belligerents. This would mean a charge against the Germans, since the joint barbarian celebration was held in her neighbors' back-yards. Of course, everything taken from her on the tragically deceitful assumptions about the high interests of humanity would be handed back or credited, and the cost of subsequent foreign military manoeuvres on her soil also deducted. Perhaps she has money coming to her. Who knows?

M. M. KNIGHT.

New York City.

Roosevelt

When the stuffed prophets quarrel, when the sawdust comes out, I think of Roosevelt's genuine sins.
Once more my rash love for that cinnamon bear begins.
His sins were better than their sweetest goodness.
His blows were cleaner than their plainest kindness.
He saw more than they all, in his hours of black blindness.
The hour of his pitiful spiritual fall
He was more of an angel than all of this host,
When with Lucifer's pride his soul was burnt out,
When, still in the game, he gave up the ghost.

His *yarns* were nearer the sky than their *truth*.
His wildest tales, in his fish-story hour,
Nearer true than their truth.
When with art and with laughter he held supreme power,
He was white as the moon, and as honest as youth.

And now their sworn word is but barnyard mud.
And their highest pride is to hide in a hole.
They talk of "dollars and dollars and dollars
And dollars and dollars," and hate his clean soul.

(Oh money, money—that never can think,
Money, money that never can rule,
Always an anarchist, always an idiot,
Always King Log—never King Stork,
Always rotting, reeking, always a fool.)

Roosevelt was proud like a singer.
Roosevelt's pride was the pride of a scribe.
Or the pride of a father, the pride of a ruler.
The pride of the thoroughbred chief of a tribe.
The pride of a brainy man, pride of a student!
He hated a coward, he hated a fool.
He knew that money is always a fool.

When they tear each others' newspaper hearts
I think of Theodore's genuine code.
He hated the paste-board, the smeary, the fake.
He hated the snake, the frog and the toad.

Oh a moose with sharp antlers!
Oh a panther of panthers! Oh a fox of foxes!
Often caught in hot boxes!
Yet we know he would always howl out the truth.
He loved the curious political game.
But we know he loved better:—truth, God and youth.

A peacock of peacocks! An eagle of eagles!
Defeating within himself the quick fox!
A buffalo roaring—a world lion roaring!
Defeating within himself the bright fox,
Then ranging out through the wilderness trail
Killing the jackal—felling the ox.
Meglomaniac, envious, glorious,
Envying only the splendors of worth.

Emulating the cleanest on earth,
(Those who were, therefore, the strongest on earth.)
Emulating thoroughbreds—always.
Peacock! Lion! Cinnamon bear!
Skyscrapers, steeples and plains for abode!
He was mostly the world's fine cinnamon bear,
He was mostly our glittering cinnamon bear,
Sitting there in an old rocking chair,
In the White House yard, taking the air.

He told us Aesop's new fables each day—
President seven big glorious years!
Seven years of wonder. They faded away
In the quarrels of the rat with the loud-voiced cootie.
Told by wireless, while the world sits breathless.
On the phonograph—on the megaphone,
By line-o-type, or by letter ripe!
The quarrels of the angle-worm with the toad. . .

Who elected these pole-cats rulers of men?

VACHEL LINDSAY.

This poem was first written for a meeting of the Illinois State Teachers' Association.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Censoring a Classic

Two Years before the Mast, by R. H. Dana. A School Edition. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $ .88.

SO important is it that every child should have an opportunity of reading Dana's great classic of the merchant service, one is loath to give more than a glance at the obvious defects of this new edition prepared for adolescent minds by two New England school-teachers. The qualifications of these two ladies, Hattie Hawley and Elizabeth Gordon, of the High School of Commerce, Worcester, Massachusetts, to assume the task of editing Dana, are not immediately apparent to a sophisticated observer. They claim their version is for "the young people of today," and the nature of their abridgement and modifications of the text of this book lead one to imagine they believe the young people of the present day to be mental and moral defectives.

The preface of the co-editors is unsatisfactory both in logic and diction. Horace Mann, they say, asked Dana to prepare a school edition of his great work, as Mann thought the ordinary version too difficult for a child. This may be true, since educators held odd notions in those days. But a juvenile edition by Dana himself was one thing, a thing for those days. We can assure parents and pedagogues that there is nothing in the book as Dana wrote it to give offence to any modern child who can spare the time from the movies to look it over.

The great virtues of this new edition, however, are the format and the price. Both are excellent, but one cannot but regret that the proof-reading has been so lightly regarded. Dana does not speak of the "chimes of oil-casks" which is unintelligible, but of the *chines,* meaning the bottoms which had cut the whaler's decks. One is sorry too, for the unfortunate child who turns to the notes to discover the meaning of the word "beachcomber" and finds it to be "one who searches the beach for things of value." That is indeed deplorable; and one may point out to the editors that it is San Juan, Capistrano, not Capestrano, in California.

A careful comparison with a regular edition does not reveal the principle upon which our authors have made their cuts. Sometimes as in the narration of Dana's conversation with Captain Thompson about a sick Kanaka, they convey the sanctimonious impression that because the wicked captain made use of "a coarse expression" he afterwards deserved to die in misery. Whole chapters are omitted and the book reduced to about seventy thousand words. The present writer is unable to conceal his distaste for this sort of mutilation. Works like Two Years before the Mast need no pruning. It is difficult to discover a word sufficiently polite yet forcible to describe such unintelligent industry. It is a commonplace of modern political economy that the people dwelling in the interior of the United States are not ship-minded. Our editors apparently assume however, that they are weak-minded.

No man who ever wrote used such plain yet luminous prose as Dana. It is always prose. The flash and glitter of Kipling, the elaborate artistry of Stevenson, the resonant and grandiose periods of Conrad, and the deliberate magnificence of Tomlinson, are not for him. These men just named are fundamentally poets. They are engaged in the task of painting fine pictures of sea and sky, with ships and men in between. Dana is a prose writer essentially. This point our editors do not adequately appreciate. A brief example can be given here. Dana says in Chapter Twenty-two:

> In an instant every one was out of his house; and there was a tall, gallant ship, with royals and skysails set, bending over before the strong afternoon breeze, and coming rapidly round the point. Her yards were braced sharp-up; every sail was set, and drew well; the Stars and Stripes were flying from her mizzen peak, and having the tide in her favor, she came up like a race-horse. It was nearly six months since a new vessel had entered San Diego, and, of course, every one was wide awake.

This, to our editors, is not suitable for "young people of today." The "tall, gallant ship" becomes "a fine tall ship." To mention her yards being braced sharp-up is unseemly and is omitted. The "Stars and Stripes" become "the Yankee ensign." The most remarkable emendation of all however is the last, for where poor Dana quite honestly believed every one was "wide awake," our lady-friends know better. Every one, it seems, "was on the *qui vive.*" So much for the Department of English of the High School of Commerce, Worcester, Massachusetts. The present writer maintains that a publisher should exercise a wise restraint in such matters. Bowdler and his successors had a comprehensible objective. The gentry who hunt out obscene books have theirs. But to change absolutely first-class prose into finical journalese serves no ascertainable purpose save to infuriate those who happen to know good English from bad. Why should Dana's vivid and sailor-like metaphor, "decks as white as flax," be botched into the cliché "as white as snow?" Nobody has ever seen decks as white as snow and nobody ever will. Sailors' speech is true. It comes from the very core of living action. It extrudes from the thing described. It is, as Mr. Conrad impatiently observed, only the landsman who "casts anchor." The seaman lets it go, and gravity does the rest. It is the most stimulating thing in the world to check one's vocabulary with the speech of those who read neither newspapers nor motion picture titles. This is not to decry the elaborate, polysyllabic beauty of a sophisticated style. But seamanship is a craft and a craft is best expressed in words of one or two syllables.

The universal appeal this book has made since its first appearance eighty-three years ago has focussed conjectures upon the secret of such success. If one were to venture a guess today, it would not be the style or the subject so much as the enormous vitality of Dana himself. He flings himself upon a paragraph of description as he went aloft, hand over hand. He fists his sentences as he was wont to fist the canvas when taking in sail, and one has the impression, on beginning a fresh chapter, of a man coming on watch, wide awake, good-tempered and ready, yet willing to pass the time with a yarn. The ease and charm of the tale make one forget the really extraordinary feature of it—the fact that a college boy should from choice seek such an experience, and having chosen it, should shape so admirably under a discipline designed more for larrikins and roustabouts. The college boy who comes to sea in our time expects rather easier going, and is a poor substitute for the regular seaman he expects to displace during the summer vacation.

There are two main reflections arising from a contemplation of the merchant marine described by Dana in his unique volume. One is the fortitude of the average sea-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man and the other is the stupidity of his commanders and owners. Taking the second point first, conceive the incredible clumsiness of every apparatus a sailor had to handle before steam came to his aid. Reflect upon the generations of sea-captains who stepped upon their quarter-decks and sailed the seas for years and died, without ever giving a single stray thought to devising something to get the work done quicker and at the cost of less killing labor. Visualize, if you can, the owners who seemed to have the mental rating of pawnbrokers and the inventiveness of a groundhog. It is the most scandalous thing in the whole history of industrialism, the wholesale sacrifice of generations of seamen of magnificent fidelity and fortitude to the aggrandisement of a class of men who lacked the intelligence to do anything with those noble virtues.

The stupidity of the average commander was less spectacular. It was revealed more in a foolish cruelty and boorishness than in anything actually wicked. Dana's Captain Thompson was unusual, but it reflects unfortunately upon a state of affairs where such vicious humbugs could reach an omnipotent position over the destinies of human beings. The old time nautical mind is very difficult to analyze.

A deep impression was made on the present writer when told by a relative, a fairly humane ship-master of the Victorian era, how he found his chief officer seizing a man up by the thumbs, so that his toes just touched the floor, as a punishment for a trivial insolence. It is hard to say which was the more striking—the brutality of the trick or the unfaltering obedience of the mate when ordered to take the man down. One is constrained to attribute a great deal of old-time cruelty on ships to low intelligence and a lack of imagination. The idea, however, that this is an indispensable concomitant of a heroic life, is rubbish.

Dana has written of a state of things gone forever, and a good riddance. The sailing ship was an expensive and troublesome makeshift and only pseudo-romantics and inland sentimentalists would ever sigh for a return to a way of life involving human beings in a round of toil compared with which a coal-mine or a chain factory afford careers of gilded leisure.

WILLIAM MCFEE.

Ramsay MacDonald

Ramsay MacDonald: The Man of To-morrow, by Iconoclast. Introduction by Oswald Garrison Villard. New York: Thomas Seltzer. $2.50.

THIS is an attempt to reach the man behind England's new prime minister, to show the political leader in the personality; and it is not a bad one. While Iconoclast's estimate has some of the verbosity of journalism, it is neither pat nor slick; and in successive chapters which lead from the situation in political England today, back to the boyhood of MacDonald in a little Scotch village, and forward again through MacDonald's intellectual development as a student of science, as secretary to an M. P., and as a member of the I. L. P., a fairly veracious portrait of the man emerges.

The author's emphasis upon MacDonald's Scotch ancestry is not without point; indeed it might have been pushed farther. The moral rigidity and intellectual sharpness of MacDonald is a common quality in the north: I remember at a Labor party conference in 1920 how the speeches of the Scotch delegates clove like torpedoes through the watery medium of debate. This rigor, this concision, this willingness to act on the statements of formal logic is a quality which the Scotch have shared with the French through the course of their long historic affiliations; and it makes a little less mysterious the adroit effort at rapprochement with Poincaré that MacDonald made as soon as he stepped into office.

In the consistency and firmness of his career MacDonald is almost a paragon among statesmen; and if he is at last in power today it is because he has never once swerved from his belief in socialism as a goal and in persuasion as a means of reaching it. His career was not merely eclipsed by the war, because of his unflinching stand as a pacifist; it was also submerged by the revolution which followed the war; for he was as much opposed to the arbitrary practice of physical force in the second case as in the first. In the summer of 1920, as every observer who was on the spot knows, it looked in England as if there might be a showdown between the imperial-financial groups and their revolutionary opponents: when the Council of Action challenged Lloyd George's monstrous Russian policy, it needed only the appearance of a militant leader among the laborites actually to transfer the power of the state from the old Cabinet to the new Council. That leader was lacking; the critical moment passed; and since then the communist movement in Great Britain has waned; while the big unions, through unemployment and internal disharmonies, have lost the decisive political power which they once seemed bound to exercise.

The only socialism that carries conviction in England today is that which is bound, like Freedom, to broaden down from precedent to precedent; and this is the sort of thing for which MacDonald has always stood. MacDonald has no illusions about the possibility of transforming the economic organization of Great Britain by parliamentary edict; but he values the processes of parliamentary government as much as he values socialism—he has a deep sense of punctilio—and in taking power his main effort is to keep the whole social organization as a going concern, until the time when it can be effectually transformed from within.

With a mind less given to logical arrangement, with a mind whose emotional attitude colored its other processes there would be something false and hypocritical about a pacifist becoming the head of the vast military organization of the modern state. It is not armaments that MacDonald is afraid of, however, but the sort of human imbecility that may be tempted to use them; he has the rational, imaginative man's cold dislike for those who cannot trace the remoter consequences of their actions. This rationality, this patience, this stability are MacDonald's main assets. When Grey announced to Parliament in August, 1914, that the country was committed to war, MacDonald said quietly in rebuttal: "I think he is wrong. I think the government which he represents and for which he speaks is wrong. I think the verdict of history will be that they are wrong." MacDonald's rise to power is part of the verdict of history; and if it does not bring the glad awakening and release that the Socialists of the eighties dreamed of, it may at any rate dissolve the nightmare in which Europe has been struggling since the war.

LEWIS MUMFORD.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Practical Americanization

Adjusting Immigrant and Industry, by William M. Leiserson. Americanization Studies. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

AMERICA'S handling of the immigrant in past decades was far from a brilliant performance. We were generous, in a way. We kept our gates open and let immigrants come in and go where they pleased and live as they pleased. Or it would be more truthful to say, as their luck, good or bad, decided. Many of them fell into the hands of conscienceless exploiters, but the most, after a period of bewilderment and hardship, fared well enough to look back without regret to the lands of their birth.

The war and the restrictive immigration laws that followed it wrought an important change in the treatment of immigrant labor. As Dr. Leiserson says, we had used our immigrant labor supply much as we used our land. We worked them both wastefully on the assumption that the supply was inexhaustible. But our days of soil robbing and of hit and miss methods of labor management are over. It is now incumbent on industry to select labor carefully, train it well, look to the conditions making for health and contentment, and in other respects to apply the same kind of business intelligence to labor management as has been applied to the handling of mechanical equipment.

Dr. Leiserson's book is a record of what has been recently attempted by public and semi-public agencies, by the employers and trade unions and by national groups themselves to adjust the immigrant worker to the conditions of American economic life. It is an intensely interesting record. No one can read it without a feeling of regret that the new science of employment management did not appear on the scene until the close of the immigration epoch in our national history. It could have spared us an incredible amount of waste—waste of skill, of hopes, of happiness. It could have relieved us of a deal of futile concern over the Americanization process. For the adjustment of the immigrant to industry, as it now works out in some of our best managed industrial plants, is a far more effective method of Americanization than any worrying body of patriotic outsiders have ever been able to devise.

Although we shall probably never again have large masses of immigrants to work into our national life, there remains for industry a great deal to do in the better placing and training of the aliens who are not yet perfectly adjusted. There is still more to do in finding the right place for the American born worker and fitting him to his task. It is this need that gives permanent value to Dr. Leiserson's book.

For incidentally it is a valuable contribution to the literature on employment management. It is to be recommended to everyone who is still obsessed with the Old World conception of the laborer as an unhappy proletarian, an automaton to be set here or there as the will or whim of the capitalist determines, yielding up the commodity "labor power" as a tree yields its fruits. American industry has discovered, or is discovering, that the active coöperation of the laborer is essential to the fullest success of an enterprise. It is discovering that without a voice in the conditions of employment such coöperation of labor is not to be had. And so we have the novel phenomenon of hundreds of hard headed captains of industry talking earnestly about the benefits of "industrial democracy." To be sure, they do not use the term in the same sense as the disciples of Sidney and Beatrice Webb. But they mean it in a sense that needs to be understood by all American students of economics.

Dr. Leiserson was unfortunate in the choice of his title. The busy student of economics and politics is likely to assume that the book would interest only those who are more or less specialists on the immigration problem. This is far from being the case. The book is worth reading from cover to cover for everyone who desires to understand the main tendencies of American economic life.

ALVIN JOHNSON.

The Children's Claims

The Claims of the Coming Generation: Essays arranged by Sir James Marchant. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. $2.50.

HERE England flies the signal of distress. Or, rather, some eight small flags flutter in a line, and their collective message is this: We are in a bad way; only the young can save us; but how can we save them?

The papers that compose the present symposium result from a conference lately held in London to consider the claims of children. The contributors represent the church, the medical profession, science, education and general philanthropic endeavor.

The situation seems to call for action. The urbanization of England has brought the slum and its evils. The general social system offers, on the one hand, prizes few but enormous; on the other, innumerable and inevitable blanks. The excess of women in the British Isles has been still further increased by the losses of the war, and the post-war demoralization among the young shows many painful features. War too, under modern conditions, kills off the mentally and physically fit; and contrasts begin to be drawn, as they were drawn in the later days of Rome, between viz, the fighting man, often abroad, and homo, the stay-at-home and begetter.

These papers have the inevitable variety of tone and texture. Some of them, like that of Professor J. Arthur Thomson, on Sex Instruction for the Young, show the deft and pliant hand of the popularizer. Others, written by eminent medical lights, exhibit the heavy, lumbering style that seems the peculiar prerogative of the physician, especially when British. Dean Inge, of St. Paul's, leads off with a eugenic paper on The Right to be Well Born. If he is a bit "gloomy," it is chiefly when he contemplates the indifference of the public: the nation is still asleep with regard to the danger of racial degeneracy; and while environmental reform may evoke enthusiasm, the improvement of the human stock itself arouses little interest.

For some years after Sir Francis Galton founded Eugenics, the new science seemed to be flourishing, and the intelligent public showed an increasing interest in it. Since the beginning of the war it has languished and seems to be dying, not of ridicule but of indifference. The scientific study of heredity of course goes on, and new discoveries are made every year; but the public absolutely refuses to treat it as a matter of practical importance.

Professor Thomson holds that the "bowdlerizing" of physiology should come to a speedy end. A sound biological training, he maintains, "will go far to prevent sniggering and morbid brooding." Above all, the proper education will exalt the conception of human love by linking it to the chivalrous, the poetic, and the romantic, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will set a premium on self-control, courtesy, mutual respect and healthy-mindedness. He is strong for opening, to the young, paths of legitimate excitement in work and play: to fill up the life is to crowd out evil.

Papers of no unusual type, on mental hygiene, elementary education, moral and religious training, and instruction looking toward worthy parenthood, complete the volume. All is to one effect and one purpose: England has made her bed, and must now remake it. Other bedmakers, though in earlier and simpler stages of activity, may well take notice: few mattresses but are better for a shaking-up, and few sheets for an airing. HENRY B. FULLER.

The Poet Assassinated

The Poet Assassinated, by Guillaume Apollinaire, translated from the French with a Biographical Notice and Notes by Matthew Josephson. New York: Broom Publishing Company. $5.00.

THE procreation, gestation, birth, love, voyages, persecution and assassination of a poet: Croniamantal by title, Guillaume Apollinaire by nom de plume, and Wilhelm de Kostrovitzki by actual name, occupy the 153 pages of well printed paper in this book, recently published by Broom. There are also five important illustrations by Dérain and Rouveyre, and four pages of notes to emphasize the epic quality of the narrative and to guide the American reader through its Parisian landmarks.

Apollinaire, the enfant terrible of the Montparnasse cubists and the godfather of Dadaism, was educated in and about a billiard room near Paris inhabited by monkeys and snakes. This we learn from Matthew Josephson's preface which cleverly is made to sound far more alien than his translation of the text, although it is built along the convincing conventions of appreciative summary and quotation; brief biography, salted down with the pleasant allusion to many proper names; and final pat statement as to his author's emphatic and essential quest for novelty. After a few pages of Apollinaire himself, we gather that he left the monkeys on bright days and picked up his letters from the fences of the neighborhood and his manners from the Breughel bar-rooms that hang in the Vienna galleries. Having accomplished this eclectic elementary education, he took on a few of the clichés that hang their stale odors over the empty bocks on the boulevards, where the disappointed dramatist makes caustic virtue out of his necessary failures, and the adolescent may watch his complexes settle into a conscious philosophy.

There is a stale odor about much of Apollinaire: even his Spring flowers seem to exhale the fragrance of the "morning after;" but his philosophy is harder to locate. In fact the only sediment of conviction that he permits his poet hero is an ultimate gesture against "the distinguished agricultural chemist Horace Tograth (a German born at Leipzig)" whom his own article in an Australian journal causes to be hailed as the leader of a universal uprising against poetry. Him Croniamantal addresses as "Boredom bringing Misery" and shortly flings his personal exaltation to the people of Marseilles in the words:

> I am Croniamantal, the greatest of living poets. I have often seen God face to face, I have borne the divine rapture which my human eyes tempered. I was born in eternity.

On the next page the poet is knifed to an ignominious death.

There are three fairly good things about the book. One is its cool singing in such lines as:

> O fecund fountain, thy waters resemble thy hair. Thy flowers are born about thee and we shall love each other always.

The second is its literary humor: a mixture of neurotic disenchantment and collegiate artlessness. Of this one must quote the advice given the hero by The Theatre:

> Do not forget the final scene, nor the words at the end, nor the fact that the more crust you have the more you shine, nor that a number cited must end in 7 or 3 in order to seem accurate; nor not to lend money to anybody who says: "I have five acts at the Odéon."

The third merit is the book's ingratiating insanity. The clouds across Apollinaire's sky change like Hamlet's from camels to weasels, but he can persuade his reader that in the metamorphosis lies the enchantment. If he is an enfant terrible, no one will wish to mother him with a switch. Rather he provokes comradeship in his mad nursery, along with the monkeys in the billiard room and Dr. Caligari in the cabinet.

MARY ELLIS OPDYCKE.

What Impedes Reform?

Political Action, by Seba Eldridge. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company. $2.00.

THE sociological method of description and evaluation is used in an attempt to analyze the obstacles which impede political and economic reform. The author's original purpose was to interpret political action in terms of the hereditary modes of behavior previously postulated and described by McDougall, Thorndike, Trotter, and others. But after the main body of the book had been carefully based on instinct, Eldridge discovered that some reputable psychologists no longer believed that acquisitiveness, submissiveness, curiosity, constructiveness, and so on, were well-directed native reactions. In this dilemma, he did not adapt the part of the book already written to the new point of view, but contented himself with giving a critical discussion of instinct in a final chapter.

Although the author commits himself to some questionable propositions concerning instinct and is also too idealistic in regard to teleology and vitalism, his practical experience with labor problems and his extended study of progressive tendencies over a period of several years combine to make his treatment of these questions both interesting and significant. The greatest difficulty in the way of securing social and economic justice is the fact that big business controls most of the suggestioning agencies and the means of communication. Many individuals continue to vote for one of the two inept and ineffectual political parties, and acquire their habits of thinking and acting largely from the well-beaten paths of custom. The numerous difficulties in the way of drawing nearer to the democratic ideal are described in a frank and wholesome fashion. Although the author believes that social justice can scarcely be secured by the ordinary educational and legal methods, it appears that free discussion will continue to be a good method of hastening reform; and in this respect the present book, and the liberal press generally, render a distinguished service.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Several of the dark features of the picture are due to the author's belief in the gregarious instinct, which is said to include not only the tendency to be and stay with those of one's kind but also the tendency to think, feel and act with one's kind. The evidence, however, in favor of gregariousness being a native tendency is very dubious. Eldridge states that the gregarious instinct, which is supposed to cause people to think and act alike, does not function except between people of the same kind. In this case, however, these individuals are already thinking and acting in the same way, and gregariousness loses its explanatory character to become merely a descriptive term.

Although the question of economic determinism is clouded in the intricacies of biology, we cannot avoid the feeling that most of the vital issues in political action are after all quite simple, and capable of being understood very well by the average individual. Instead of the unusual emphasis on the influence of biological factors, some would prefer a simpler description, for example, of the way money is made, how it is used, the method by which it is exempted from taxation, and the general effects on human welfare.

HULSEY CASON.

The Tomb of Tut-ankh-amen

The Tomb of Tut-ankh-amen, discovered by the late Earl of Carnarvon and Howard Carter, by Howard Carter and A. C. Mace. New York: George H. Doran Company. $5.00.

THE amazing discovery of an almost intact tomb of an Egyptian pharaoh, with all that it may add to our knowledge of a problematic period in history, art, and religion, is the epic theme of this preliminary but authoritative work. The tale is told as simply as its marvels would permit. A specialist in Egyptology will feel that an undue proportion of the book (about one third) is devoted to introductory matters, the biography of Lord Carnarvon, accounts of his earlier excavations in Egypt and of the previous history of the Valley of the Kings' Tombs; but these may be justified by the Earl's lamented death in the midst of his triumph and by the general reader's unfamiliarity with things Egyptian. One regrets also that the invaluable illustrations were not more adequately reproduced. It was Mr. Carter's good fortune to obtain the skilled coöperation of his friend Mr. Callender, of Mr. Mace and other members of the Metropolitan Museum expedition, whose concession at Thebes adjoined his own, of Mr. Lucas the Egyptian government chemist, and of the distinguished Egyptologists Gardiner of England and Breasted of America. No previous scientific undertaking in Egypt has been so completely blessed. With such advantages, the explorer's head was not turned; he contemplated years of self-restraint while methodically investigating, preserving, and restoring the countless treasures of the tomb. One chapter, on Visitors and the Press, is devoted to explaining why, for the sake of future knowledge and the safety of the treasures themselves, the public likewise must show present restraint and forego casual but continuous interruptions of the work. The Egyptian government has unfortunately seen fit only recently to dispossess Mr. Carter and his associates, disregard all caution, and compromise scientific values for the sake of current display. It is to be hoped that Mr. Carter may be reinstated in control and that this tomb of tombs may not suffer the fate of various great discoveries made in the past in Egypt under governmental auspices.

T. GEORGE ALLEN.

Galápagos: World's End

Galápagos: World's End, by William Beebe. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. $9.00.

SOME five hundred miles off the coast of Ecuador a cluster of tiny islands sizzle under a tropical sun. These are the Galápagos. The sparse xerophytic life which clings to these lava blocks have remained one of the greatest biological marvels in the world since Darwin first described them eighty-five years ago. These islands afford one of Nature's best demonstrations of rapid evolution within closely related groups of organisms. The ground finches, for example, exhibit almost every conceivable type of beak form. Such a variety of shape has evolved without any correlation to food or habitat. Some unexplained "internal factors" working on stocks isolated on different islands have produced an extraordinary assemblage of creatures all obviously related and yet each differing from the other in certain striking peculiarities. Numerous are the expeditions which have come to this archipelago to study and correlate these variations, to fathom if possible the dynamic forces at play among these desert dwellers so far removed from the rest of the world. The analysis which these technicians have made has been published and laid aside for other biologists of similar training to study. It remained for Beebe to visit these isles and bring back not a chemical analysis but a picture of the life. With a broad brush and bright colors Beebe has given us his interpretation of one of Nature's greatest wonderlands. Beebe and his party were less than one hundred hours in this laboratory of Nature and yet their "record of spontaneous observation," their "crystallization of the more obvious and characteristic impressions of land and sea," will occupy a unique place among the stories of scientific adventure.

G. KINGSLEY NOBLE.

Contributors

GEORGE SOULE is director of the Labor Bureau, New York City, and author of The New Unionism in the Clothing Industry (with J. M. Budish).

FRANK H. SIMONDS, journalist, has just returned from England. He has written They Shall Not Pass—Verdun, 1916, and A History of the World War.

WILLIS T. NEWTON, former president of the Los Angeles Teachers Association, is business manager of the Los Angeles School Journal and a teacher of civics and economics at the Manual Arts High School, Los Angeles.

RALPH BLOCK is managing editor of the story department of the Famous Players-Lasky Corporation.

VACHEL LINDSAY is the author of General Booth Enters Heaven, the Congo and other Poems, The Chinese Nightingale, The Golden Book of Springfield, etc.

WILLIAM MCFEE, sea-going engineer, has published several books, among them An Ocean Tramp, Aliens, Casuals of the Sea, Command, and Race.

LEWIS MUMFORD is the author of The Story of Utopias. His most recent book, Sticks and Stones: An Interpretation of American Architecture and Civilization, will be brought out this fall by Boni and Liveright.

HENRY B. FULLER has published novels of middle western life and stories of Italian travel.

MARY ELLIS OPDYCKE has for several years written musical criticism for the New York Sun.

HULSEY CASON is a contributor to several scientific and general magazines.

T. GEORGE ALLEN is connected with the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.

DR. G. KINGSLEY NOBLE is Curator of the Department of Reptiles and Amphibians at the American Museum of Natural History. He has had varied field experience in South America and has been closely associated with Mr. Beebe in investigating the rare reptiles and amphibians discovered by Mr. Beebe in British Guiana.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Harcourt, Brace & Company

383 Madison Ave., N. Y.

ANNOUNCING!

A new novel by the author of "The World's Illusion" and "The Goose Man"

GOLD

By

Jacob Wassermann

An epic of the human race between 1870 and 1920 symbolized by a wealthy German middle-class family and the girl, Ulrika Woytich, whose primitive vitality and ambition profoundly affect every life she touches. *Over 400 pages.* $2.50

Robert Herrick's

WASTE

"Belongs with 'Babbitt' and 'Main Street' and 'The Titan' and 'The Genius' as an impeachment of American life."—*Chicago Daily News.* $2.00

Maxwell Bodenheim's

CRAZY MAN

"Mr. Bodenheim is, with the possible exception of Sherwood Anderson, the most original of American novelists."—*N. Y. Evening Post.* $2.00

Special Saturday Night Lectures 8.20 P. M.

At the New School for Social Research—465 West 23 St., New York Under the auspices of the Students Co-operative Association

May 10th—BERTRAND RUSSELL,
Freedom vs. Authority in Education
Admission $1.00
This is the last Saturday night lecture

CHANGING CONCEPTIONS IN JEWISH EDUCATION

by Emanuel Gamoran, Ph.D.

Comprises two books in one: JEWISH EDUCATION IN RUSSIA AND POLAND and PRINCIPLES OF THE JEWISH CURRICULUM IN AMERICA. The first takes up the background of the majority of our present Jewish immigration, and the second discusses the ways of bridging the gap between the old and new environments, at the same time retaining the old Jewish traditions.

$2.00

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
64-66 Fifth Ave., New York

The **DEBATE** *of the Day!*

BERTRAND **RUSSELL** *versus* SCOTT **NEARING**
Chairman
SAMUEL UNTERMYER

Can the **SOVIET IDEA** *take hold of* **AMERICA ENGLAND and FRANCE?**

SUBJECT:

RESOLVED: ***That the Soviet form of government is applicable to Western Civilization***

MR. RUSSELL, Negative MR. NEARING, Affirmative

Sunday, May 25th, 1924, at 3 P. M.

CARNEGIE HALL, 57th St .and 7th Avenue

Tickets: $3.00, $2.50, $2.00, $1.50 and $1.00 plus war tax

ON SALE AT
Carnegie Hall Box Office, 57th St. and 7th Ave.
Jimmie Higgins' Book Shop, 127 University Pl., near 14th St.
Gothic Art Book Shop, 127 Second Ave., near 12th Street
Maisel's Book Store, 424 Grand Street, cor. Attorney
Epstein's Drug Store, 1674 Madison Ave., near 110th St.
M. Stern's Jewelry Store, 1337 Wilkins Ave., Bronx
Katz's Drug Store, 78 Graham Ave., Williamsburg
Neidorf's Book Store, 1817 Pitkin Ave., Brownsville

THE LEAGUE FOR PUBLIC DISCUSSION
500 Fifth Avenue LONGACRE 10435-6384

EDUCATIONALIST with background of culture and social experience desires post as chaperone to young woman. Address Box 264, New Republic, 421 W. 21st Street, New York City.

"Second only to the dictionary"

ROGET'S INTERNATIONAL THESAURUS

"For well over half a century it has been to countless literary workers a very present help."—*Dial.*

($3.00)

THOS. Y. CROWELL CO., NEW YORK

Brentano's Inc. NEW YORK 5th Ave at 27th St
Booksellers to the World
Mail Telephone Cable Telegraph
ALL BOOKS ALL LANGUAGES
New York-Chicago-Washington-London-Paris

AN EXCEPTIONAL INTRODUCTORY OFFER!

A New Nature and Garden Magazine for one year, and 12 Valuable Gladiolus Bulbs—large flowering kind that will bloom this summer **25c** postpaid to you for . .

Every lover of Nature, home and garden should quickly take advantage of this unusual offer, void after May 31. You will be delighted with the literary charm and distinction of this periodical.

THE SUNNIGLOW TRUMPETER
SUNNIGLOW GARDENS
Box 203 North Wales Penna.

FAREWELL LECTURE BY
HON. BERTRAND RUSSELL
Subject
"HOW TO BE FREE AND HAPPY"
at COOPER UNION
Eighth Street and Third Ave.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28th
at 8.15 P.M. Sharp.
NORMAN HAPGOOD, Chairman
Farewell Committee Headed by
REV. JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
and
HEYWOOD BROUN
Tickets—75c and $1.
All seats reserved—For sale, starting May 9th, at
RAND SCHOOL, 7 East 15th St. and
CIVIC CLUB, 14 West 12th St.
AUSPICES FREE YOUTH
7 EAST 15th STREET, ROOM 504
Tel., Stuyvesant 4620

SEXOLOGY
PSYCHOANALYSIS
AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Latest catalogs, ten cents. Sent in plain envelope. The foremost authoritative works for members of the Professions and Advanced Adult Readers.

Established 1899
THE BOOK LEAGUE
47 West 42 Street, New York

CAMP UTOPIA
Lake Ellis, Wingdale, N. Y.
A vacation ground for grown-ups
In the Berkshire Hills
120 minutes from Grand Central
Opening May 29th
Make reservations now for Decoration Day Week-End
W. J. PERLMAN, *Managing Director* DR. WILL DURANT, *Associate Director*
Address 2000 Broadway, N. Y. C.
Phone Columbus 2454 or Bensonhurst 0759

HUDSON GUILD FARM
in the hills of Northern Jersey. Open for week ends.
Rates $4 a day. Tel., Chickering 8754

WRITER WILL AID in preparation of manuscripts for publication. Experience: college teaching, newspaper and magazine publicity, editor on weekly. Address Box 265, New Republic, 421 W. 21st St.

Please mention The New Republic when writing to advertisers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED